

Equitable Congestion Pricing under the Markovian Traffic Model: An Application to Bogotá

Alfredo Torrico

CDSSES, Cornell University, alfredo.torrico@cornell.edu

Natthawut Boonsiriphatthanajaroen

Cornell University, nb463@cornell.edu

Nikhil Garg, Andrea Lodi

Jacobs Institute, Cornell Tech, ngarg@cornell.edu, andrea.lodi@cornell.edu

Hugo Mainguy

University of Maryland, hmainguy@umd.edu

Congestion pricing is used to raise revenues and reduce traffic and pollution. However, people have heterogeneous spatial demand patterns and willingness (or ability) to pay tolls, and so pricing may have substantial equity implications. We develop a data-driven approach to design congestion pricing given policymakers' equity and efficiency objectives. First, algorithmically, we extend the Markovian traffic equilibrium setting introduced by Baillon & Cominetti (2008) to model heterogeneous populations and incorporate prices and outside options such as public transit. In this setting, we show that a unique equilibrium exists. Second, we empirically evaluate various pricing schemes using data collected by an industry partner in the city of Bogotá, one of the most congested cities in the world. We find that pricing personalized to each economic stratum can be substantially more efficient and equitable than uniform pricing; however, non-personalized but area-based pricing can recover much of the gap.

Key words: Pricing, Congestion Games, Equity, Game Theory Applications

1. Introduction

Given increasing congestion, pollution, and budget concerns, cities are turning to *congestion pricing* to charge drivers to use the roadways. Modern approaches propose to leverage technology that allow, for example, roadway, time-of-day, or per-person specific prices without needing to deploy substantial on-the-road infrastructure – using either mobile phone applications or sensors on cars (ClearRoad 2024, Cramton et al. 2018). The promise of these technologies is to enable data-driven prices, much like advances in algorithmic pricing have transformed ride-hailing platforms.

However, making pricing decisions in a data-driven manner is challenging. First, there are several potential desiderata when making such decisions: reducing congestion and raising revenue, for example. Furthermore, the city may desire the policy to have *equitable* impacts, for a suitable notion of equity: For instance, that prices are evenly distributed spatially, or that people of different wealth levels are still able to access the roadways at equitable rates. Second, the impact of a given

policy, for any fixed objective, is difficult to predict: It is unclear how any individual will react to a given set of prices – will they react by paying the fee and continuing to drive, by reducing the number of trips they take, or by changing the timing or the route they take? Further complicating this calculation is that behavior and ultimate objective values are *equilibria* values: Each potential driver’s behavior depends on each option’s travel time, which in turn depends on the behavior of other drivers – and behavior is likely to differ by, e.g., wealth.

In this work, we demonstrate how a government can make such decisions in a data-driven manner, overcoming some of these challenges. Our contributions are as follows:

Algorithmic and Methodological Contributions. We consider the Markovian traffic equilibrium introduced by Baillon and Cominetti (2008). Travelers make stochastic arc-level decisions, capturing variability in travelers’ perception of route costs. To study the impact across different socioeconomic groups, we extend this model to the case with multiple agent types, and introduce two new aspects to make the model more suitable to the study of congestion pricing: (1) Users can choose an outside option at the beginning of the trip, e.g., using public transit, and (2) the route cost is composed of both a time component and a price component. In this setting, we show that a flow equilibrium exists and is unique. This approach provides a tractable, extensible model to study congestion pricing and other design questions. In particular, it captures both stochastic behavior and heterogeneous cost-time valuations, where users can endogenously opt instead for an alternative option. Given a set of prices, we algorithmically find the equilibrium flow – and thus the fraction of trips completed per agent type, revenue collected, travel speed, and other metrics.

Empirical Applied Contributions. We use our methodological framework to study the design of congestion pricing in Bogotá, Colombia, currently one of the most congested cities in the world. We empirically evaluate different pricing schemes in the equilibrium model and analyze their impact with respect to revenue, equity, and efficiency – based on travel times, costs paid, fraction of trips completed, etc. We calibrate our model using demand matrices (origin and destination pairs for members of different socioeconomic groups, called *strata* in Bogotá) that were calculated using data collected by our industry partner. We ask: What are the implications of different pricing schemes? We especially focus on equity impacts on different strata.

We evaluate the following schemes: (i) *uniform* pricing, in which all primary roads are priced the same per distance; (ii) *per-stratum* pricing, in which these prices may differ by socioeconomic group; (iii) *per-area* pricing, in which prices may differ by geography but are the same for all primary roads and strata within a geographic area. These schemes represent various approaches a government may pursue: (i) uniform pricing is the simplest to implement; on the other hand, (ii) per-stratum may be more “equitable” to those with lower ability to pay tolls but would require more sophisticated tolling infrastructure that can do personalized pricing – and more generally be

technically or politically intractable; as we show, (iii) per-area pricing can adequately interpolate (i) and (ii) as it is similar to uniform pricing in terms of implementation and can achieve the equity levels of per-stratum pricing.

Our primary empirical findings are twofold. First, uniform pricing is highly inequitable, in terms of the proportion of trips started, average speed, and usage of primary roads by each strata. Second, per-area pricing can recover much of the equity benefits of per-strata pricing while increasing overall revenue. This follows because where people live, and the origin-destination matrix more generally, varies substantially by strata. Therefore, per-area pricing can be a proxy for per-stratum pricing. In particular, per-area pricing – even when is coarsely implemented – can achieve higher welfare for each social group, higher total welfare, and higher revenue than uniform pricing, and is generally comparable to the welfare levels of per-stratum pricing.

Related Literature

Network Equilibrium and Efficiency. Traffic equilibrium models (also known as *selfish routing* or *congestion games*) have been extensively studied by different communities. For brevity, we only present the work that is most relevant in our context. The notions of network equilibria can be traced back to Knight (1924) and later formalized by Wardrop (1952). Beckmann et al. (1956) presented the first mathematical formulation of traffic equilibrium, and, since then, different models have been studied including equilibrium analysis for non-atomic (Beckmann et al. 1956, Braess et al. 2005, Daganzo 1982, Fukushima 1984, Pigou 1912) and atomic agents (Monderer and Shapley 1996, Rosenthal 1973); for more details, we refer to (Florian and Hearn 1995, 1999, Nisan et al. 2007). Stochastic equilibrium models have also been widely studied in the literature, see, e.g., (Baillon and Cominetti 2008, Daganzo and Sheffi 1977, Dial 1971). For more details see (Baillon and Cominetti 2008, Florian and Hearn 1999) and the references therein.

From a modeling perspective, our work is based on the Markovian model introduced by Baillon and Cominetti (2008) where agents make random choices at each node in their route according to the cost of the remaining path. The authors show that a traffic equilibrium can be found by solving a strictly convex program. We emphasize that this model, and thus our work, captures only the spatial dynamics and not inter-temporal dynamics; for the latter, we refer to (Florian and Hearn 1999). In our work, one could rerun our analyses using data from different inter- or intra-day data.

Network performance (efficiency) in selfish routing models has also been analyzed, in particular, the notion of *price of anarchy* that measures the gap between the equilibrium cost and the social optimum cost, see, e.g., (Cominetti et al. 2021, Correa et al. 2004, Johari and Tsitsiklis 2004, Roughgarden 2005, Roughgarden and Tardos 2002, 2004).

Congestion Pricing. One way to ameliorate the inefficiencies in selfish routing is by affecting agents' behavior via network pricing. The initial ideas on *marginal congestion pricing* were informally discussed by Pigou (1912) who asserts that, on each edge, a user should pay the price (tax or toll) that is equivalent to the amount of delay that their presence provokes on other users. Decades later, Beckmann et al. (1956) have shown that under the assumption of homogeneous users, there exists a set of edge prices for which the equilibrium attains the minimum social cost, i.e., inefficiencies disappear. Later, Cole et al. (2003) have shown an analogous result for the heterogeneous case and, moreover, have proved that the optimal prices can be computed efficiently. The design of congestion pricing schemes can take mainly two forms: first-best and second-best. The former refers to the postulates on marginal edge pricing of Pigou (1912). Other works along this line are (Arnott and Small 1994, Smith 1979). The second-best refers to the schemes that restrict the set of edges that can be priced. Most of this literature focuses on solving a mathematical programming formulation with equilibrium constraints, see, e.g., (Brotcorne et al. 2001, Ferrari 2002, Labbé et al. 1998, Larsson and Patriksson 1998, Lim 2002, Patriksson and Rockafellar 2002); for more details on pricing schemes, we refer to the survey by Florian and Hearn (1999). The hardness of computing optimal second-best prices is studied, e.g., in (Bonifaci et al. 2011, Harks et al. 2015, Hofer et al. 2008). Several works have considered heterogeneous congestion pricing schemes, e.g., (Feng et al. 2023, Lazar and Pedarsani 2020, Mehr and Horowitz 2019). In particular, Brown and Marden (2016) studied the case of affine cost functions and users with different willingness to pay. Most of the literature has focused either on deterministic equilibrium models or homogeneous pricing schemes. Our work, instead, studies congestion pricing schemes in a stochastic equilibrium model with heterogeneous users.

Equity in Congestion Pricing. It has long been established that congestion pricing has a direct impact on social equity, see, e.g., (Eliasson 2016, Eliasson and Mattsson 2006, Gemici et al. 2018, Levinson 2010, Wachs 2005). Therefore, the literature has focused on ameliorating its effects by studying different strategies. One of those strategies involves congestion pricing and *revenue refunding* schemes in which the revenue collected by the tolls is redistributed among the population – for example, in terms of infrastructure investments (Goodwin 1990, Small 1992). From a technical standpoint, these schemes have been analyzed for single-bottleneck models (Arnott and Small 1994, Bernstein 1993), parallel networks (Adler and Cetin 2001) and single origin-destination networks (Eliasson 2001). The second strategy corresponds to the design of *Pareto-improving* schemes (Lawphongpanich and Yin 2007, 2010, Song et al. 2009), aiming to minimize the total congestion while ensuring that no user is worse off as compared to no-pricing. Guo and Yang (2010) and Jalota et al. (2021) have investigated schemes that are both revenue refunding and Pareto-improving. Other equitable strategies such as tradable credit schemes have been studied by Wu et al. (2012).

Most related is the recent and complementary work of Maheshwari et al. (2024), who also developed a computational framework to analyze the efficiency and equity of various congestion pricing schemes in terms of how they affect different populations that are both spatially distributed and have different willingness (or ability) to pay tolls. While sharing the same high-level motivation, our work differs in the notion of equilibria, algorithmic framework, data, and application. In particular, Maheshwari et al. (2024) pre-fix a subset of feasible routes between each origin-destination pair and do not model outside options, and their solution does not induce unique route selections. Their approach is more computationally efficient (a linear program to obtain prices, unlike a grid search over prices as we require) but does not allow calculation of the same metrics such as travel time or cost paid by the group.¹ By applying their framework to data from the San Francisco Bay Area in the United States, they find that their schemes improve both efficiency and equity compared to the status quo, and that schemes personalized to different populations can be more equitable. They also find that spatial pricing is competitive with heterogeneous pricing in the SF Bay Area.

Equity and Pricing in Operations. Finally, our work broadly connects to a growing interest in analyzing and considering the fairness or equity implications of canonical operational questions, especially in government, spanning both theoretical and empirical work (e.g., Barre et al. (2024), Bertsimas et al. (2011, 2012), Jo et al. (2023), Liu et al. (2023), Liu and Garg (2024), Manshadi et al. (2021), Rahmattalabi et al. (2022), Singh et al. (2022)). One line of work, in particular, considers fair personalized pricing schemes in non-traffic settings (Cohen et al. 2022, 2021, Kallus and Zhou 2021). To this literature, our work contributes an empirical example in which specific design choices – e.g., spatial rather than uniform pricing – yield substantially different equity outcomes, along with an analysis of revenue-equity tradeoffs. We further note that a large literature in operations has recently considered algorithmic spatio-temporal pricing in ride-hailing marketplaces, including its potentially heterogeneous effects on riders and drivers in equilibria (Bimpikis et al. 2019, Castillo 2023, Castro et al. 2023, Freund and van Ryzin 2021, Garg and Nazerzadeh 2022, Hu et al. 2022, Lobel 2021, Ma et al. 2022, Yan et al. 2020).

2. Model

At a high level, our model is as follows: As in the *Markovian Traffic Equilibrium* model, non-atomic agents have demand for each origin-destination pair and (random) perceived route costs. The cost is an arc-based function of the travel time, price, and sensitivity parameters. In this traffic model, agents' decisions are made at each node during their trip, which leads to a Markov chain with arc-based transition probabilities. Agents may also choose to take the outside option at the beginning

¹ We thank the first author of Maheshwari et al. (2024) for this discussion.

of their trip, which is dependent on the observed flows. Given the above, the agents' choices induce a traffic equilibrium that directly impacts the travel time and cost of each trip. In our formulation, agents belong to different *types* (socioeconomic groups), each with different demand distributions, outside option valuations, and sensitivities to travel time and price.

Notation. We write in bold to indicate a vector/matrix and in italic to indicate scalar values, for example, $\mathbf{z} = (z_i)_{i \in [n]}$. To denote a random variable, we put a tilde over the corresponding letter and the letter without it represents its expected value, for example, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{z}] = z$. For a parameter or variable that relates to the outside option, we write a circle accent, for example, \mathring{z} . We provide a summary of the most relevant notation in Tables 1 and 2.

2.1. Background: The Markovian Traffic Equilibrium Model

In the following, we briefly describe the original *Markovian traffic equilibrium* model introduced by Baillon and Cominetti (2008). Consider a traffic network represented by a strongly connected digraph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A})$, where \mathcal{N} is the set of nodes and \mathcal{A} the set of arcs, and a subset of nodes $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ that denotes the destinations. In this network, there is a set of non-atomic agents who each make routing decisions between origin-destination (OD) pairs. We emphasize that the original model in (Baillon and Cominetti 2008) assumes that all agents are of the same type. Let $g_{i,d} \geq 0$ be the aggregated demand for trips between the OD pair (i, d) . The overall goal of a traffic equilibrium model is to capture how these demands flow throughout the network. An equilibrium (if any) highly depends on how agents perceive *route costs* that may be determined by multiple factors such as travel time, distance and monetary costs. In a deterministic model, every agent has the same perceived cost for a given route, while in a stochastic model, perceptions can vary across agents. In particular, in the Markovian traffic equilibrium model, agents' behavior is assumed to be an arc-based recursive decision process where, at each node along the route, the agent chooses the arc (from a set of available options) with the lowest *random* cost to-go, i.e., the cost of the remaining route towards the destination.

Formally, let f_a be the expected flow through arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then, the cost of arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$ perceived by each non-atomic user is the perturbation of a deterministic cost, specifically, $c_a + \tilde{\varepsilon}_a$, where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_a$ is a continuous random variable with zero mean and $c_a = \ell_a(f_a)$ is the expected cost of arc a that is a function of the expected flow f_a .² Note that c_a captures the expected cost perception of arc a (which is the same across all users) and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_a$ is the variability in perception. We assume that the cost function $\ell_a : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a strictly increasing continuous function. With the above, the cost of a route $r \in \mathcal{R}_{i,d}$ is given by $\sum_{a \in r} (c_a + \tilde{\varepsilon}_a)$, where $\mathcal{R}_{i,d}$ is the set of all possible simple

² Function ℓ_a is also known as the latency of arc a .

paths for the OD pair (i, d) . Since the cost of a route is a random variable, then the optimal cost $\tilde{\tau}_{i,d} := \min \{ \sum_{a \in r} (c_a + \tilde{\varepsilon}_a) : r \in \mathcal{R}_{i,d} \}$ and the cost of an arc $a = (i_a, j_a)$ with respect to destination d (cost to-go) defined by $\tilde{z}_{a,d} = c_a + \tilde{\varepsilon}_a + \tilde{\tau}_{j_a,d}$ are also random variables. Since the random cost of each arc is the sum of two terms, expectation plus variability, then we can equivalently write the random optimal cost and cost to-go as $\tilde{\tau}_{i,d} = \tau_{i,d} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,d}$ and $\tilde{z}_{a,d} = z_{a,d} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d}$ where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,d}$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d}$ are continuous random variables with mean 0, respectively.³

The sequential decision process of a non-atomic agent that is traveling between the OD pair (i, d) is as follows: Upon reaching a node i , they observe the random cost to-go $\tilde{z}_{a,d}$ of every outgoing arc $a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+$ and choose the one with the lowest value.⁴ Formally, the agents' decisions are captured by the following component-wise non-decreasing, concave and smooth functions, which are also known as choice models: For every pair of nodes $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}$, consider the function

$$\varphi_{i,d}(\mathbf{z}_d) := \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \{ z_{a,d} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d} \} \right],$$

where \mathbf{z}_d is the vector whose components are $z_{a,d}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Note that $\varphi_{i,d}$ defines the expected optimal decision of the users at node i , i.e., they choose the minimum cost to-go. Given these choice functions, for each destination $d \in \mathcal{D}$, the sequential process can be captured by a Markov chain over the network \mathcal{G} whose transition probabilities are defined as: For each node $i \neq d$ and arc $a = (i, j) \in \mathcal{A}_i^+$

$$P_{i,j}^d := \mathbb{P} \left(\tilde{z}_{a,d} \leq \tilde{z}_{e,d}, \forall e \in \mathcal{A}_i^+ \right) = \frac{\partial \varphi_{i,d}}{\partial z_{a,d}}(\mathbf{z}_d),$$

and zero otherwise. In words, at node i the probability that the agent transitions to node j is equal to the probability that the cost to-go of arc a has the lowest random value. To ease the exposition, we do not make explicit the dependence of the transition probabilities on \mathbf{z}_d , i.e., $P_{i,j}^d = P_{i,j}^d(\mathbf{z}_d)$. For more technical details on the derivation of the second equality above, we refer the reader to Baillon and Cominetti (2008). Moreover, in this Markov chain, each destination $d \in \mathcal{D}$ is assumed to be an absorbing state, i.e., we have $P_{d,d}^d = 1$ and $P_{d,j}^d = 0$ for all $j \neq d$. Consequently, these transition probabilities determine how the expected flow that enters a node splits among outgoing arcs. Formally, let $x_{i,d}$ be the expected flow that enters node i towards destination d . Then, for each node $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and outgoing arc $a = (i, j) \in \mathcal{A}_i^+$, we write the expected flow that traverses arc a towards destination d as

$$v_{a,d} := x_{i,d} \cdot P_{i,j}^d. \tag{1}$$

³ Note that, with a slight abuse of notation, we write random variabilities indexed over arcs $\tilde{\varepsilon}_a$ for all arcs a , over OD pairs $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,d}$ for all OD pairs (i, d) and over pairs (arc, destination) $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d}$ for all arcs a and destination d .

⁴ The set of outgoing arcs is defined as $\mathcal{A}_i^+ = \{ a \in \mathcal{A} : a = (i, j) \}$.

Intuitively, for a given realization of the perception variabilities of the non-atomic users, $v_{a,d}$ corresponds to the fraction of users that reached node i and chose to continue their route via the outgoing arc $a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+$. Given this, the flow conservation constraint for each node $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and destination $d \in \mathcal{D}$ corresponds to

$$x_{i,d} := g_{i,d} + \sum_{a=(i',i) \in \mathcal{A}_i^-} x_{i',i} \cdot P_{i',i}^d = g_{i,d} + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} v_{a,d}, \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{A}_i^- is the set of incoming arcs. In words, the left-hand side of Equation (2) corresponds to the flow that exits node i and on the right-hand side we have the demand at that node plus the flow that comes via incoming arcs. Finally, the total flow that traverses $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is defined as

$$f_a := \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} v_{a,d}. \quad (3)$$

Our goal now is to relate the expected cost to-go of an arc a with the expected optimal cost of the remaining route after passing through a . For this, recall that we wrote the random cost to-go of an arc a towards destination d in two different ways: $\tilde{z}_{a,d} = \tilde{c}_a + \tilde{\tau}_{j_a,d}$ and $\tilde{z}_{a,d} = z_{a,d} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d}$. Then, due to the Bellman's principle, we can recursively express the random optimal cost $\tilde{\tau}_{i,d}^s$ for any node $i \in \mathcal{N}$ along the route as the the minimum cost to-go (among all outgoing arcs from i), i.e., $\tilde{\tau}_{i,d} = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \{\tilde{z}_{a,d}\}$. By taking the expectation, we obtain

$$\tau_{i,d} = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_{i,d}] = \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \{\tilde{z}_{a,d}\} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \{z_{a,d} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d}\} \right] = \varphi_{i,d}(\mathbf{z}_d),$$

where the first equality is because $\tilde{\tau}_{i,d}$ has a zero mean and the second equality is because $\tilde{z}_{a,d} = z_{a,d} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d}$. On the other hand, we also have that

$$z_{a,d} = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{z}_{a,d}] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{c}_a + \tilde{\tau}_{j_a,d}] = c_a + \tau_{j_a,d},$$

where we used that: (i) $\tilde{z}_{a,d}$ has a mean value of zero, (ii) $\tilde{z}_{a,d} = \tilde{c}_a + \tilde{\tau}_{j_a,d}$ and (iii) \tilde{c}_a also has a zero mean. Consequently, using both calculations above, we can derive the equation

$$z_{a,d} = c_a + \varphi_{j_a,d}(\mathbf{z}_d) \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{A}, d \in \mathcal{D},$$

which, equivalently, defines the fixed-point equation

$$\tau_{i,d} = \varphi_{i,d} \left((c_a + \tau_{j_a,d})_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \right), \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (4)$$

We are now ready to define the notion of equilibrium in this stochastic model.

DEFINITION 1 (BAILLON AND COMINETTI (2008)). A vector $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is a *Markovian traffic equilibrium (MTE)* if and only if \mathbf{f} satisfies (3), where the values $v_{a,d}$ satisfy the flow conservation constraints (2) with \mathbf{z}_d solving (4) for $c_a = \ell_a(f_a)$.

Baillon and Cominetti (2008) show that, under certain conditions, there exists a unique MTE that can be obtained by solving a smooth strictly convex program. We conclude this section by summarizing the most relevant notation in Table 1, which will help the reader to follow the next section.

Table 1 Summary of the most relevant notation in Sections 2.1 and 2.2. To denote dependency on a given stratum s , we write a superscript s on the expressions in this table when needed, for example, $z_{a,d}^s$ instead of $z_{a,d}$.

\mathcal{N}	Set of nodes	$\tau_{i,d}$	Expected optimal cost of OD pair (i, d)
\mathcal{A}	Set of directed arcs	$P_{i,j}^d$	Transition probability of arc $a = (i, j)$ to dest. d
\mathcal{D}	Set of destinations	$x_{i,d}$	Expected flow entering i towards dest. d
\mathcal{S}	Set of possible strata	$v_{a,d}$	Expected flow through arc a towards dest. d
$g_{i,d}$	Demand between OD pair (i, d)	f_a	Total expected flow through arc a
c_a	Expected cost of arc a	$\varphi_{i,d}$	Choice model function of OD pair (i, d)
ℓ_a	Time cost function of arc a	κ_a	Monetary cost function of arc a
$z_{a,d}$	Expected cost to-go of arc a to dest. d	p_a	Price for using arc a

2.2. Our Model: Multiple Agent Types and Monetary Costs

One limitation of the model presented in the previous section is that it assumes that every non-atomic user has the same expected cost per arc, c_a . Similarly, the cost perception variability $\tilde{\varepsilon}_a$ does not vary among different agents and just depends on each arc. While in principle this may be true when *time* is the only aspect considered in the arc's cost, the cost perception can significantly vary among different users when other components such as monetary costs are also included. In particular, congestion pricing can affect the users' decision-making process since individuals differ in their willingness to pay. Intuitively, low-income populations might be less able to pay tolls, while the high-income population could easily afford price increases without drastically changing their behavior. In this section, we introduce a Markovian traffic equilibrium model with two additions: (i) a monetary component is included in each arc cost that allows us to study different pricing schemes; (ii) multiple agent types (socioeconomic groups that we call *stratum*) who differentiate in their willingness-to-pay, modeling different users' behaviors. In the next section, we further model an outside option in which agents can decide not to take the trip via car at all.

Consider a discrete set \mathcal{S} of strata (i.e., agent types). For each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we denote by \mathcal{D}^s the set of possible destinations and $g_{i,d}^s$ the demand of stratum for the OD pair (i, d) with $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$. We denote by $\kappa_a : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ the monetary cost function associated to each arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$, i.e., for a price p_a^s (possibly personalized to stratum s) then the cost of using a is $\kappa_a(p_a^s)$. To ease the exposition, we assume this function only depends on the arc, but our results apply when is also

stratum-dependent.⁵ On the other hand, as in the previous section, let ℓ_a be the time cost function of arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$, which we assume is not dependent on the strata. We denote by t_a the expected time cost of that arc, which is flow-dependent via function ℓ_a , i.e., $t_a = \ell_a(f_a)$ for a flow $f_a \geq 0$ going through arc a . Finally, let $\beta^{s,t} \geq 0$ and $\beta^{s,p} \geq 0$ be the sensitivity to time and price costs, respectively, for each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$. We can interpret the ratio $\beta^{s,t}/\beta^{s,p}$ as the willingness-to-pay of stratum s , i.e., we are “willing to give up” $\beta^{s,t}$ units of time for $\beta^{s,p}$ units of money. Again, for simplicity, we assume that these sensitivity parameters are not dependent on each OD pair, however, our results follow in the more general case. Given this, the total expected cost of stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ for using arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$ with price $p_a^s \geq 0$ is

$$c_a^s := t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) = \ell_a(f_a) + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s). \quad (5)$$

We can now analogously define the notation that we introduce in the previous section but stratum-dependent. For each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we denote by $z_{a,d}^s$ and $\tau_{i,d}^s$ the expected cost to-go of arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$ towards destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$ and the expected optimal cost from node $i \in \mathcal{N}$ to destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$, respectively. Therefore, the choice model of stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is similarly defined as: For $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$,

$$\varphi_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{z}_d^s) := \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \{z_{a,d}^s + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d}^s\} \right],$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{a,d}^s$ is the random variability of the cost to-go of arc a towards destination d perceived by stratum s . Therefore, analogous to the previous section, we can conclude that $\tau_{i,d}^s = \varphi_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{z}_d^s)$ for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$. The fixed-point equation can be equivalently derived as we did for (4), which in the stratum-dependent context corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{i,d}^s &= \varphi_{i,d}^s \left((c_a^s + \tau_{j_a,d}^s)_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \right) \\ &= \varphi_{i,d}^s \left(\left(t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) + \tau_{j_a,d}^s \right)_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \right), \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathcal{S}, i \in \mathcal{N}, d \in \mathcal{D}^s. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Then, as in (2), we can obtain the following equations for the model with multiple strata:

$$v_{a,d}^s = x_{i,d}^s \cdot P_{i,j}^s, \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{N}, a = (i,j) \in \mathcal{A}_i^+, s \in \mathcal{S}, d \in \mathcal{D}^s, \quad (7a)$$

$$x_{i,d}^s = g_{i,d}^s + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_i^-} v_{e,d}^s, \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathcal{S}, i \in \mathcal{N}, d \in \mathcal{D}^s, \quad (7b)$$

where $v_{a,d}^s$, $x_{i,d}^s$ and $P_{i,j}^s$ have analogous definitions as the ones in the previous section, while they are now dependent on the stratum s . As before, to avoid extra notation in the transition probabilities,

⁵ This means that for a given arc, the differences in monetary costs only arise because of the price inputs which we allow to be dependent on $s \in \mathcal{S}$. However, one may think on a more general model where the structure of the function also changes for each stratum, e.g., the low-income population paying for just using a road while the high-income stratum paying per distance of the same road.

we write $P_{i,j}^s = P_{i,j}^s(\mathbf{z}_d^s)$. Finally, the total expected flow that traverses arc a is the sum of the flow produced by all strata, i.e.,

$$f_a := \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} v_{a,d}^s. \quad (8)$$

We are now ready to define an equilibrium flow for our setting.

DEFINITION 2. A vector $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is a *MTE flow under multiple strata and monetary costs* if and only if \mathbf{f} satisfies (8), where the values $v_{a,d}^s$ satisfy the flow conservation constraints (7) with $z_{a,d}^s = t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a) + \tau_{j_a,d}^s$ where $\tau_{j_a,d}^s$ solves (6) for $t_a = \ell_a(f_a)$.

2.2.1. MTE: Existence and Uniqueness. In this section, we show that, for the general model with multiple strata and monetary costs, a Markovian traffic equilibrium flow exists and it is unique. Before proving our main result, we denote by

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ \mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{A}} : \exists \hat{\tau} \text{ such that } \hat{\tau}_{i,d}^s < \varphi_{i,d}^s \left(\left(t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a) + \hat{\tau}_{j_a,d}^s \right)_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \right), \forall i \neq d, s \in \mathcal{S} \right\}, \quad (9)$$

which, in words, corresponds to the set of expected travel times for which one can guarantee that users reach their destination in finite time with probability one. To prove existence and uniqueness in our context, one can show that the system of equations (7) has a unique solution when $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{C}$ and, consequently, these equations define unique implicit functions $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot,d}^s = \mathbf{x}_{\cdot,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$, $\mathbf{v}_{\cdot,d}^s = \mathbf{v}_{\cdot,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$, $\tau_{\cdot,d}^s = \tau_{\cdot,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$ for each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$. Moreover, these functions are concave, smooth and component-wise nondecreasing. We include the proof of these results in Appendix A.

By using the implicit functions above, one can redefine the notion of equilibrium in our setting as $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{A}}$ being a MTE if and only if $f_a = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} v_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$ with \mathbf{t} satisfying $t_a = \ell_a(f_a)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Or equivalently, \mathbf{t} satisfying $\ell_a^{-1}(t_a) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} v_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$. Given this, our main result is as follows.

THEOREM 1. *Assume $\mathbf{t}^0 \in \mathcal{C}$ where $t_a^0 = \ell_a(0)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Then, there exists a unique MTE given by $f_a^* = \ell_a^{-1}(t_a^*)$, where \mathbf{t}^* is the unique solution of the smooth strictly convex program*

$$\min_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{C}} \Phi(\mathbf{t}) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \int_{t_a^0}^{t_a} \ell_a^{-1}(y) dy - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{i \neq d} g_{i,d}^s \tau_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t}) \quad (10)$$

Proof. First, recall that for each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$ functions $\tau_{\cdot,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$ are concave, smooth and component-wise nondecreasing. Thanks to Lemma 2 in Appendix A, we know that Φ is strictly convex and coercive,⁶ then Φ has a unique optimal solution \mathbf{t}^* . Therefore, this point must satisfy $\nabla \Phi(\mathbf{t}^*) = 0$. Let us compute $\nabla \Phi$: For each $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we get

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t_a} = \ell_a^{-1}(t_a) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{i \neq d} g_{i,d}^s \cdot \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial t_a}(\mathbf{t}).$$

⁶ Function Φ is coercive if $\Phi(\mathbf{t}) \rightarrow \infty$ when $\|\mathbf{t}\| \rightarrow \infty$.

Due to Lemma 3 in Appendix A, we know that for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we have that

$$\sum_{i \neq d} g_{i,d}^s \cdot \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial t_a}(\mathbf{t}) = v_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t}).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t_a} = \ell_a^{-1}(t_a) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} \sum_{i \neq d} g_{i,d}^s \cdot \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial t_a}(\mathbf{t}) = \ell_a^{-1}(t_a) - \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} v_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t}) = 0,$$

which means that the unique optimal solution \mathbf{t}^* must satisfy $\ell_a^{-1}(t_a) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} v_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$, i.e., \mathbf{t}^* defines a MTE flow vector \mathbf{f} via $f_a = \ell_a^{-1}(t_a^*)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. \square

We remark that to obtain Theorem 1 we cannot immediately apply the result in (Baillon and Cominetti 2008). This is because the cost function of each arc is stratum-dependent and one could naïvely try to define a flow equilibrium \mathbf{f} with $\tau_{i,d}^s$ solving (6) for c_a^s satisfying (5), but inverting this as a function of f_a is not possible. However, in our setting the crucial aspect is that the expected cost function of each arc is a separable function of the flow-dependent time function and the monetary cost function that only depends on the prices. This allows us to define a flow equilibrium with $\tau_{i,d}^s$ solving (6) for $t_a = \ell_a(f_a)$, i.e., only accounting for the flow-dependent time cost. It is an open question whether an MTE admits a variational characterization for the general model with costs that depend both on the stratum and the flow of the corresponding arc. We emphasize that Theorem 1 applies for any stratum-dependent monetary cost function that depends solely on the price of the arc. In our case study, we assume that users pay a price that depends only on basic characteristic of the arc.

Due to Theorem 1, we can guarantee that, for a fix pricing scheme, an appropriate descent method will converge to the unique equilibrium. We formalize our method in Algorithm 1 that is adapted to include other modeling choices such as the possibility of users taking an outside option (e.g., public transit).

3. Modeling Details and Algorithm

In this section, we present the specific users' choice models that we considered for the application in Bogotá and, also, how we introduce the outside option. Later, we present our main method to compute equilibria. We summarize the most relevant notation in Table 2.

3.1. Choice Models

In our setting, we assume that agents make decisions according to a logit choice model. Specifically, recall that for a stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$, a destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$ and an arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$, the cost to-go value is defined as $\tilde{z}_{a,d}^s = z_{a,d}^s + \tilde{\epsilon}_{a,d}^s$. Given $i \in \mathcal{N}$, we assume that $\tilde{\epsilon}_{a,d}^s$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+$ are i.i.d. Gumbel

random variables with scale parameter $\beta^{s,t} \geq 0$ which, as we defined earlier, denotes the sensitivity of stratum s to the travel time. This implies that the function $\varphi_{i,d}^s$ is

$$\varphi_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{z}_d^s) = -\frac{1}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \log \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \exp(-\beta^{s,t} \cdot z_{a,d}^s), \quad (11)$$

which gives us the classic multinomial-logit transition probabilities, i.e., for $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $a = (i, j) \in \mathcal{A}_i^+$

$$P_{i,j}^s = \frac{\partial \varphi_{i,d}^s}{\partial z_{a,d}^s}(\mathbf{z}_d^s) = \frac{\exp(-\beta^{s,t} \cdot z_{a,d}^s)}{\sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \exp(-\beta^{s,t} \cdot z_{e,d}^s)}, \quad (12)$$

where the expected cost to-go value is $z_{a,d}^s = t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) + \tau_{j_a,d}^s$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\beta^{s,t} \cdot z_{a,d}^s = \beta^{s,t} \cdot t_a + \beta^{s,p} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) + \beta^{s,t} \cdot \tau_{j_a,d}^s.$$

From this expression, note that since both sensitivity parameters are non-negative, then a flow or price increase in arc a will decrease the probability of choosing a , as defined in (12).

Table 2 Summary of the notation in Section 3.

$\beta^{s,t}, \beta^{s,p}$	Sensitivity of stratum s to time and price
$\hat{\beta}^{s,t}, \hat{\beta}^{s,p}$	Sensitivity of stratum s to time and price of the outside option
$\hat{t}_{i,d}$	Travel time of the outside option for OD pair (i, d)
$\hat{p}_{i,d}$	Monetary cost of the outside option for OD pair (i, d)
$\hat{c}_{i,d}^s$	Cost of the outside option for OD pair (i, d) and stratum s
$\hat{P}_{i,d}^s$	Probability of taking the outside option for stratum s and OD pair (i, d)

3.2. Adding an Outside Option

In this work, we assume that the demand is elastic, i.e., a trip that is either too expensive or too time-consuming will be made through an alternative option. One way to model this is: For each OD pair, add an arc that connects those nodes directly and add the corresponding cost function. However, with this approach, agents would be allowed to interrupt their routes at any moment, which is unrealistic because travelers rarely switch their trip means in the middle, unless this is planned in advance.

Our goal is to model the case when an agent decides not to take a trip by car because is costly and prefers to take an outside option, which in the following means using public transit.⁷ For this, we assume that the agent decides – at their starting node – whether to initiate the trip by comparing the cost to-go of the available routes versus the cost of the outside option. In other

⁷ Our framework allows to also consider the case in which a trip is completely canceled or the case of both canceling and public transit at the same time. However, for simplicity here we restrict to the use of public transit.

words, the demand of each OD pair $g_{i,d}^s$ is adjusted by the fraction of users of stratum s that are willing to drive given the current observed flows.

Formally, for each OD pair (i, d) , we define the cost of the outside option as

$$\hat{c}_{i,d}^s = \hat{t}_{i,d} + \frac{\hat{\beta}^{s,p}}{\hat{\beta}^{s,t}} \cdot \hat{p}_{i,d}, \quad (13)$$

where $\hat{t}_{i,d}$ is the travel time of the outside option for the OD pair (i, d) , $\hat{p}_{i,d}$ is the monetary cost of taking the outside option (e.g., bus ticket), and $\hat{\beta}^{s,p}, \hat{\beta}^{s,t} \geq 0$ are the strata-specific price and time sensitivity parameters of the outside option, respectively. Given this, the probability of an agent of stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ of choosing the outside option instead of starting the trip between the OD pair (i, d) is

$$\hat{P}_{i,d}^s = \frac{\exp\left(-\hat{\beta}^{s,t} \cdot \hat{c}_{i,d}^s\right)}{\exp\left(-\hat{\beta}^{s,t} \cdot \hat{c}_{i,d}^s\right) + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \exp\left(-\beta^{s,t} \cdot z_{a,d}^s\right)}. \quad (14)$$


Note that this probability depends on the current network flows because of the expected costs-to-go values $z_{a,d}^s$. Finally, the demand of stratum s for the OD pair (i, d) is scaled by a factor $1 - \hat{P}_{i,d}^s$ and the flow conservation constraints are re-defined as

$$v_{a,d}^s = x_{i,d}^s \cdot P_{i,j}^s, \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{N}, a = (i, j) \in \mathcal{A}_i^+, s \in \mathcal{S}, d \in \mathcal{D}^s, \quad (15a)$$

$$x_{i,d}^s = g_{i,d}^s \cdot (1 - \hat{P}_{i,d}^s) + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_i^-} v_{e,d}^s, \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathcal{S}, i \in \mathcal{N}, d \in \mathcal{D}^s. \quad (15b)$$

We note that Theorem 1 still holds in this context. This is because one can model the inclusion of an outside option as a *meta-network* of two layers. The first layer accounts for the car road network and the second layer corresponds to the network of the outside option (public transit). Then, for each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and OD pair (i, d) with $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$, we add a dummy node i' which we relabel as i that gets demand $g_{i',d}^s = g_{i,d}^s$. We also add an arc (i, i_1) where i_1 is in the first layer and an arc (i, i_2) where i_2 is in the second network layer. The cost of the arc (i, i_2) corresponds to the cost of the outside option. Assuming that users follow a logit choice model, then we get transition probabilities $P_{i,i_2}^s = \hat{P}_{i,d}^s$ and $P_{i,i_1}^s = 1 - \hat{P}_{i,d}^s$. Therefore, Theorem 1 holds for the congestion game that occurs over this meta-network. We provide an example of this representation in Figure 1. We note that we are only interested in the flow conservation equations of the first network, so we penalize the demand by a factor $1 - \hat{P}_{i,d}^s$ as we did in Equations (15). One could imagine a more complex model with multiple layers modeling different modes of transportation, however, this is out of the scope of this work.

Figure 1 Meta-network with two layers. Layer in red indicates the road network (cars) and the layer in blue indicates the outside option network (e.g., public transit). The demand $g_{i,d}^s$ splits according to probabilities $1 - \hat{P}_{i,d}^s$ and $\hat{P}_{i,d}^s$.



Algorithm 1 Method to compute a Markovian traffic equilibrium

Input: Graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A})$, destinations \mathcal{D} , demands $g_{i,d}^s$, tolerance $\delta > 0$, prices p_a^s

Output: Traffic equilibrium flow $\mathbf{f} = (f_a)_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$.

- 1: Let \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f}' be flow vectors such that $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{f}' = \infty$.
 - 2: **while** $\|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}'\| > \delta$ **do**
 - 3: Compute costs $c_a^s = \ell_a(f_a) + \frac{\beta^s, p}{\beta^s, \tau} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s)$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$.
 - 4: **for** $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}$ **do**
 - 5: Solve $\tau_{i,d}^s = \varphi_{i,d}^s \left((c_a^s + \tau_{j_a,d}^s)_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \right)$ via fixed-point iteration, with $\varphi_{i,d}^s$ defined in (11).
 - 6: Compute matrices $\mathbf{P}^{s,d}$, $\mathbf{Q}^{s,d}$ using $\tau_{i,d}^s$ values.
 - 7: Build vector \mathbf{y} with components $y_i = g_{i,d}^s \cdot (1 - \hat{P}_{i,d}^s)$ for every $i \in \mathcal{N}$, $i \neq d$.
 - 8: Solve flow conservation constraints $\mathbf{x}_d^s = [\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{P}^{s,d})^\top]^{-1} \mathbf{y}$.
 - 9: Compute $\mathbf{v}_d^s = \mathbf{Q}^{s,d} \cdot \mathbf{x}_d^s$.
 - 10: Compute $\mathbf{f}' = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbf{v}_d^s$.
 - 11: $\mathbf{f} \leftarrow \mathbf{f} - \alpha_k \cdot (\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}')$, where α_k is the step size at the k -th iteration.
-

3.3. Finding the Equilibrium Flow Given Prices

Given the guaranteed existence and uniqueness shown in Theorem 1 and the introduction of an outside option in the previous section, we can now present our main method to compute a Markovian traffic equilibrium. First, let us recall the vectorial notation that we used in previous sections. For a given stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$, we denote by $\mathbf{x}_d^s = (x_{i,d}^s)_{i \neq d}$ the vector where each component is the flow that enters node $i \neq d$ towards destination d and $\mathbf{v}_d^s = (v_{a,d}^s)_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ the vector whose components are the expected flow that traverses arc a towards destination d . Similarly, let $\mathbf{g}_d^s = (g_{i,d}^s)_{i \neq d}$ be the demand vector with components indexed by $i \neq d$, $\mathbf{P}^{s,d} = (P_{i,j}^{s,d})_{i,j \neq d}$ be the transition matrix and, finally, $\mathbf{Q}^{s,d} = (Q_{i,a}^{s,d})_{i \neq d, a \in \mathcal{A}}$ be an auxiliary matrix indexed by node $i \neq d$

and arc a such that $i_a = i$, specifically,

$$Q_{i,a}^{s,d} = \begin{cases} P_{i,j_a}^s & \text{if } i = i_a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

with the transition probabilities defined in (12).

We formalize our method in Algorithm 1. This algorithm receives as an input a fixed set of roadway prices and proceeds to compute a flow equilibrium by using the following first-order descent algorithm (Problem (10) can be viewed as an unrestricted convex problem with a unique optimum) with a fixed-point method as a subroutine:

(i) In the inner loop, for each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$, we find values $\tau_{i,d}^s$ via a fixed-point iteration (Step 5). With these values, the transition probabilities can be computed (Step 6). Then, a linear system is solved to obtain flows $x_{i,d}^s$ and, consequently, $v_{a,d}^s$ (Steps 8-9). The latter are aggregated to obtain the incumbent flow vector \mathbf{f}' (Step 10).

(ii) In the outer loop, we obtain the next flow vector \mathbf{f} via a first-order update using \mathbf{f}' (Step 11).

The process above continues until the norm of the difference between \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{f}' is smaller than the desired tolerance. Note that Algorithm 1 follows the same high-level idea as the method provided in (Baillon and Cominetti 2008), i.e., a first-order descent method with a fixed-point iteration as an inner loop. The main differences between Algorithm 1 and the method proposed by Baillon and Cominetti (2008) are the penalization of the demand due to the outside option (Step 7) and the for-loop over multiple strata (Step 4). We remark that Step 5 is solved by a standard fixed-point iteration method, i.e., we iterate over $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\tau_{i,d}^{s,n+1} = \varphi_{i,d}^s \left((c_a^s + \tau_{j_a,d}^{s,n})_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \right) \quad (16)$$

until the difference between the current and the incumbent points has a norm below the desired threshold. For our computational study, we implemented various acceleration tools to improve the running-time performance of Algorithm 1 in large-scale instances, as several steps are computationally expensive; we describe these accelerations in Section 5.3.

4. Welfare and Revenue via Price Optimization

Our goal in this work is to study different pricing schemes and analyze the change on users behavior, ultimately, to balance welfare (of a given stratum or the whole society) and total revenue. Towards this goal, Algorithm 1 is key as it finds the unique equilibrium flow *for a given set of prices*. In the remainder of this section, we assume that we have access to this algorithm as an oracle. Then, we focus on optimizing prices through a grid search in an outer loop, for a given set of pricing policies.

We consider arc-based pricing policies, i.e., agents of stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ must pay p_a^s units of money for using arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and the final cost of the arc is determined by the monetary cost function on that price, i.e., $\kappa_a(p_a^s)$. Formally, we define a *pricing scheme* as follows.

DEFINITION 3. A pricing scheme corresponds to a vector of prices $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S}}$ defined over the set of arcs \mathcal{A} for each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$. In particular, we empirically consider pricing schemes of the three following types:

1. *Uniform pricing*: $p_a^s \in \{0, p\}$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$ with $p \geq 0$.
2. *Pricing per stratum*: $p_a^s \in \{0, p^s\}$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$ with $p^s \geq 0$. We also refer to this scheme as personalized pricing.
3. *Pricing per area*: $p_a^s \in \{0, p_a\}$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A}$ with $p_a \geq 0$ depending on the geographical location of a in the network \mathcal{G} . We also refer to this as area pricing.

Note that both pricing per stratum and per area are (different) generalizations of uniform pricing. Namely, one can set the same price for every stratum in the case of per-stratum pricing or the same price for every area in per-area pricing (we simulate this setting in Appendix C). However, whether they are strictly better (for a given objective) than uniform pricing depends on the distribution of OD pairs. For instance, consider a network with the same uniform OD pairs distribution for each stratum, then intuitively area pricing may not be strictly better than uniform pricing. Additionally, a comparison between personalized pricing and area pricing is not direct. Neither generalizes the other and which is better on any given metric depends on the topology of the network and the distribution of OD pairs of each stratum. For example, if the OD pairs of each stratum are in different regions of the networks, then we can recover personalized pricing via area pricing and vice versa. We further note that, for computational simplicity, we do not consider per-area per-stratum personalized prices. In our data application, we will designate “secondary” (e.g., local roads) and “primary” roads (e.g., motorways, highways) – prices for secondary roads will be 0, while all primary roads will be priced the same (but potentially varying per strata or area).

Each choice of prices directly impacts the flow equilibrium in the network as per the definition of the expected cost of each arc in (5) and transition probabilities (12). Our main goal is to empirically investigate how these pricing schemes impact the total *welfare* of the population, the welfare of each stratum, and the total revenue collected. Moreover, we investigate their effect on other metrics such as the proportion of trips started, distance traveled, road efficiency, and road type usage.

Now, we define the notion of welfare for a specific stratum. Roughly speaking, for a given pricing scheme, the welfare of stratum s is the expected time difference (if the agent either drives or takes the outside option) minus the monetary cost of the trip. In other words, the welfare measures how much time (on average) the agents are gaining/losing for what they are paying. Formally, for a stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and an OD pair (i, d) with $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$, let $t_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{p}) = t_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}))$ be the total expected travel time⁸ and $\kappa_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{p}) = \kappa_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}))$ be the total expected cost of stratum s when the pricing scheme

⁸ Recall that the travel time is dependent of the stratum because their choice behavior is captured by their transition probabilities, which may thus differ based on sensitivity to pricing. In other words, groups more sensitive to pricing may opt for secondary roads, increasing travel time.

is $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{A \times S}$. Note that both expressions actually depend on the flow equilibrium resulting when imposing pricing scheme \mathbf{p} , but to ease the exposition, we avoid this extra notation unless otherwise stated.

DEFINITION 4 (WELFARE). We define the welfare of the non-atomic agents in stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ as the function $W^s : \mathbb{R}_+^{A \times S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which, for a given pricing scheme \mathbf{p} , outputs

$$W^s(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{|G^s|} \cdot \sum_{(i,d) \in G^s} \left[\left(t_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{0}) - t_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{p}) - \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{p}) \right) \cdot (1 - \mathring{P}_{i,d}^s) + \left(t_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{0}) - \mathring{t}_{i,d} - \frac{\mathring{\beta}^{s,p}}{\mathring{\beta}^{s,t}} \cdot \mathring{p}_{i,d} \right) \cdot \mathring{P}_{i,d}^s \right],$$

where $G^s = \{(i, d) : i \in \mathcal{N}, d \in \mathcal{D}^s \text{ such that } g_{i,d}^s > 0\}$ is the set of OD pairs that have positive demand by stratum s and $t_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{0})$ corresponds to the total expected travel time when there is no pricing on the roads.

Observe that, to minimize notation in Definition 4, we do not write the dependence of the welfare on the flow equilibrium, i.e., $W^s(\mathbf{p}) = W^s(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}))$. The first term of the welfare corresponds to when the agent chooses to start the trip with probability $(1 - \mathring{P}_{i,d}^s)$. In that case, the travel time for the OD pair without congestion pricing $t_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{0})$ is compared to the cost of the trip with congestion pricing that accounts for time and monetary costs: $t_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{p}) + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{p})$. One interpretation is: If the difference is positive, then it means that agents have a surplus in time (trips are shorter) that is higher than the welfare loss due to the monetary cost paid. If the difference is negative, then needing to pay worsens the agents' welfare (in terms of time and money). The second term in Definition 4 corresponds to when the agent chooses to take the outside option. In that case, the travel time without pricing is compared to the cost of the outside option which includes the outside option's travel time $\mathring{t}_{i,d}$ and the monetary cost $\mathring{p}_{i,d}$. Overall, then, the welfare metric corresponds to the change in each traveler's welfare when compared to no pricing, averaged over the OD pairs.

Finally, the *total welfare* is then defined as the sum of strata,

$$W(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} W^s(\mathbf{p}).$$

Given the above, our first goal is to study the Pareto frontier between the welfare of stratum s and the total welfare. For this, let us consider the following price optimization problem: Given $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}} \quad \lambda \cdot W^s(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})) + (1 - \lambda) \cdot W(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})) \quad (17a)$$

$$s.t. \quad \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}) = \text{ALG}(\mathbf{p}), \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}, \quad (17b)$$

where \mathcal{P} is the set of feasible pricing schemes and $\text{ALG}(\mathbf{p})$ is the function that runs Algorithm 1 with price input \mathbf{p} and outputs the flow equilibrium vector $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})$. In this work, we optimize Problem (17) through a grid search over prices \mathbf{p} , where the flow equilibria algorithm is solved for each set of considered prices. Solving problems akin to Problem (17) in a single optimization is an open question for future work.

Our second goal is to study the tradeoffs between the welfare of a given stratum and the total revenue. We define the *expected revenue* collected from a given stratum s when the pricing scheme is \mathbf{p} as

$$R^s(\mathbf{p}) = R^s(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} f_a^s \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s),$$

where f_a^s is the total equilibrium flow of stratum s in arc a , i.e., $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}^s} v_{a,d}^s$ and $\kappa_a(p_a^s)$ is the total amount of money paid for using arc a . Then, the *total expected revenue* collected by the decision-maker is

$$R(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} R^s(\mathbf{p}).$$

As in (17), we study the Pareto frontier between the welfare of stratum s and the total revenue. For this, let us consider the following price optimization problem: Given $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\max_{\mathbf{p}} \quad \lambda \cdot W^s(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})) + (1 - \lambda) \cdot R(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p})) \quad (18a)$$

$$s.t. \quad \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{p}) = \text{ALG}(\mathbf{p}), \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (18b)$$

Similarly to the previous optimization problem, we optimize Problem (18) through a grid search over prices \mathbf{p} , where the flow equilibria algorithm is solved for each set of considered prices.

5. Case study: Data and Setup Description

We now perform an empirical analysis in the city of Bogotá, one of the most congested cities in the world (INRIX 2022, TomTom 2023). For this, we use OD pairs of demand data collected by our industry partner ClearRoad in early 2022. We now describe the experimental setup, in particular, the cost functions and sensitivity parameters, among others. Then, we will proceed to describe the road network and data.

5.1. Time and Monetary Cost Functions

One of the main aspects of our model is the expected cost function presented in (5), which is a separable function of time and price cost components. Let us recall this cost: For an arc $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ is defined as

$$c_a^s = \ell_a(f_a) + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s),$$

where $\ell_a(f_a)$ is the time cost of the flow f_a that traverses arc a and p_a^s is the price that stratum s pays for using that arc. In our computational study, we use the strictly increasing time cost function

$$\ell_a(f_a) = t_a^0 \cdot \left(1 + \gamma_a \cdot \left(\frac{f_a}{b_a} \right)^{\nu_a} \right), \quad (19)$$

where $t_a^0 = \ell_a(0)$ is the travel time through a with empty roads (i.e., without flow), b_a is the capacity of the arc, and ν_a, γ_a are fitting parameters. The function in (19) is known as the Bureau of Public Roads power function (Bureau of Public Roads 1964) which is widely used in the transportation literature to model how travel time increases with arc flow.

For the monetary cost function, we consider two aspects of the road (arc): its length and whether is a primary or secondary road, where primary corresponds, roughly speaking, to major high-capacity or higher-speed roads. Formally, we use the strictly increasing price cost function

$$\kappa_a(p_a^s) = p_a^s \cdot l_a \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{a \text{ is primary}\}}, \quad (20)$$

where l_a is the travelling distance of arc a and $\mathbb{1}_{\{a \text{ is primary}\}}$ is the indicator whose value is 1 when a is primary and zero otherwise. Note that in this price cost function, agents are paying for the distance traveled only when using a primary road. This function is also commonly used for tolling, where only a subset of roads are tolled and tolls are based on the length traveled. We note that our framework is flexible to other choices of (20), such as cordon-based policies in which travelers must pay a fixed cost to enter an area (in that case, one can charge a fixed price on each incoming arc to that area).

5.2. Data Description

We now specify our data, summarized in Table 3.

Road Network. We extract the road network using the Open Street Maps Networkx (osmnx) library in Python. We chose as the city center the point (4.67172, -74.11290) and a radius of 10 kilometers. The types of roads chosen were: primary, primary link, secondary and secondary link. To make the problem tractable, we consolidated intersections within a radius of 70 meters.⁹ Finally, we pre-processed the graph as follows: We got the largest strongly connected component and then we removed any node with 0 outgoing arcs.¹⁰ A map of the resulting network is depicted in Figure 2 and we color primary/secondary roads in Figure 7 in the Appendix. We note that the main road in the middle (that goes from NW to SE) corresponds to the primary road that connects the airport

⁹ This can create duplicated edges, but we consider only the main arc and not its copies.

¹⁰ This means that every node could be a trip origin. Also note that because of strong connectivity, every node is reachable.

with the city. Historic center (most touristic area) is on SE corner. The wealthiest neighborhoods of Bogotá are on the E area. On the other hand, the poorest neighborhoods of Bogotá are on the SW area and bottom of the network. For more details we refer to the Strata Data detailed below and Bogotá stratification maps in Figure 8 in the Appendix.

Table 3 Instance Summary. Last 3 rows: The value in **Figure 2** Road Network: Nodes are in red and dashed parentheses indicate the number of OD pairs. lines indicate area splits.


Center Coordinates	4.67172, -74.11290
City Radius	10 km.
Nodes	543
Roads (Arcs)	1213
Primary Roads	592
High-income Demand	1462 trips (1004)
Mid-income Demand	5146 trips (3836)
Low-income Demand	2762 trips (2134)



Strata Data. Since the 1990s, neighborhoods in each district (*localidad* in Spanish) of Bogotá are socioeconomically classified from 1 to 6, where 1 is the poorest and 6 is the wealthiest; for more details (in Spanish) we refer to (Secretaría Distrital de Planeación Bogotá 2024) or (Jessel 2017), and for a map of the stratification we refer to Figure 8 in the Appendix. The goal of this stratification is the subsidy of utilities and services such as electricity, telephone bills, and trash collection. In other words, the high-income population pays more to subsidize the lower-income population – notably, then, per-stratum congestion pricing schemes have precedence in the city. In our model, we aggregate the strata in the following way: We say that agents are *low-income* if they belong to strata 1-2, *mid-income* if they belong to stratum 3, and *high-income* if they belong to strata 4-6. This means that our strata set is $\mathcal{S} = \{\text{high-income, mid-income, low-income}\}$. As apparent in Table 3, our data is primarily composed of low- and mid-income trips.¹¹

Demand Data. The anonymized data was provided to us by ClearRoad, which piloted a mobile application-centric approach to charge congestion prices. The data is organized into trips, each conducted by one of the pilot participants. Each trip is composed of a sequence of GPS points

¹¹ We choose not to calibrate the data according to demographic data on where each stratum lives – it is unclear how to calibrate driving demand, given the population distribution.

Figure 3 Instance Demand Data

where each GPS point comes with the following information: Latitude/Longitude value, a timestamp, and an estimate by ClearRoad of whether the user is currently in a private vehicle (as opposed to walking, cycling, or public transportation). In this work, we use data collected over 139 days on 204 users, starting from February 24, 2022, to July 13, 2022. Because we are analyzing the road network, we focus on the trips that contain vehicle rides. Out of 64287 trips, there are only 38553 with vehicles. However, some of these trips with vehicles also contain a part where the user is not in a vehicle. Thus, we extract the tracked points during which users are estimated to be in a private vehicle.

We used the trips' GPS data to construct the demand matrix of OD pairs as follows: For each trip that crosses the network area in Figure 2, we trimmed the trip to those GPS points that lie in the area. We consider the (updated) starting and ending GPS points as the origin and destination, respectively. Since these may not perfectly correspond to nodes in our graph (Figure 2), we project them to the nearest nodes in the network. This resulted in 1462 trips of high-income demand, 5146 trips of mid-income demand, and 2762 trips of low-income demand.

To implement our *pricing per area* scheme, we partition the network area with a simple 2 by 2 grid, where the nodes in the top cell belong to N, the nodes in the right cell belong to E, the nodes in the bottom belong to S and the remaining ones belong to W. Given this partition, we are able to analyze the demand more closely as shown in Figure 3. First, in Figure 3a, we show the percentage of trips between given areas relative to the total number of trips of a stratum (i.e., the sum of the bars of the same color is 1). We observe that most of the demand is concentrated on trips inside E, inside S and inside N. For example, E receives 12% of the total low-income demand, 15% of the total mid-income demand, and 35% of the total high-income demand. On the other hand, S receives

more than 25% of the total low-income demand, 15% of the total mid-income demand and less than 10% of the total high-income demand. We observe that these demand trips are correlated with the stratification of the city (Figure 8) since low-income strata lives in S and high-income population lives in the NE area. Notably, trips that starts in W receive almost no high-income demand and most of the demand comes from low-income strata which, again, may be due to the segregation in the city. Other demanded trips are N to E (mostly dominated by high-income; similarly for E to N) and S to E (roughly uniform across strata; similarly for E to S). The rest of the demand is minor compared to the ones mentioned before. Second, in Figure 3b, we show the percentage of trips that enter/exit a given area, relative to the total of that area (i.e., each bar sums to 1). We clearly see the differences between the demand of low-income and high-income in S, E and W. We also observe that most of the demand comes from mid-income as shown in the details in Table 3.

5.3. Parameters Tested

In this section, we briefly present each of the parameters' and inputs' values that we tested.

Parameters in the Time Cost Function. Parameters ν_a and γ_a in Equation (19) significantly affect the convergence of our method, so we consider the values that led to the most stable results: $\gamma_a = 0.02$ and travel time scaling exponent $\nu_a = 2$ (used also in Baillon and Cominetti (2008)). Also, we computed the travel time of an empty arc t_a^0 by using the maximum speed and the length of the arc (both pieces of information can be obtained with the osmnx library). Finally, we set the arcs' capacities b_a as follows: we multiply the number of lanes by the length (distance in kilometers) of the arc and divide by the average size of a car.

Price and Time Sensitivity Parameters. We assume that all strata are equally sensitive to time, specifically, we set $\beta^{s,t} = 1$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. However, we assume that strata differ in their sensitivity to price – that high-income strata are less sensitive to higher costs. We set these parameters to $\beta^{s,p} = 0.5$ for $s = \text{high-income}$, $\beta^{s,p} = 0.7$ for $s = \text{mid-income}$ and $\beta^{s,p} = 1$ for $s = \text{low-income}$, respectively. In other words, this means that the higher-income population is willing to pay twice more for using an arc than lower-income agents. Our framework is flexible to this choice.

Outside Option Parameters. For the cost of outside option in Equation (13), we chose the following parameters: For every OD pair (i, d) we set $\hat{t}_{i,d}$ as the lowest total travel time between i and d when the roads are empty (i.e., no flow) multiplied by a factor of 3 and $\hat{p}_{i,d} = 500$ (e.g., the cost of the public transit ticket is 500).¹² We set the sensitivity parameters of the outside option to: $\hat{\beta}^{s,p} = 1$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ (i.e., all strata are equally sensitive to the cost of the transit ticket).¹³

¹² These values were chosen to make the outside option attractive.

¹³ We chose the same price-sensitive parameter of the outside option for all strata as our goal is to study the impact of congestion pricing rather than the interactions between choosing the outside option or driving. The framework is flexible to this choice, and results are qualitatively robust: alternative choices would simply scale the value of the outside option for each stratum.

Finally, we set the time sensitivity of the outside option as follows: $\hat{\beta}^{s,t} = 1.2$ for $s = \text{high-income}$, $\hat{\beta}^{s,t} = 1.1$ for $s = \text{mid-income}$ and $\hat{\beta}^{s,t} = 1$ for $s = \text{low-income}$. Note that the closer to zero this parameter is, the less likely that stratum is to start a trip by car, according to probabilities in Equation (14); thus, overall, the low-income group is assumed to be more likely to take the outside option of public transit.

REMARK 1. We performed a robustness analysis (Appendix D) in which we tested different willingness to pay of the strata, outside option parameters, Bogotá at different scales and demand perturbations. Perhaps surprisingly, the only parameters that matter are the differences in willingness to pay.

5.4. Method Overview

In the following, we provide details on how we implemented our Algorithm 1, the acceleration techniques that we used and, finally, how we run our simulations using the outputs of our method.

Algorithm 1 Setup. Let us briefly summarize how the experiments were performed. We run Algorithm 1 with step size $\alpha_k = \max\{0.125, 1/(k+1)\}$ as in Baillon and Cominetti (2008) where k is the iteration number of the outer-loop. The fixed-point iteration method was implemented with a tolerance of 10^{-1} or for a maximum of 1000 iterations, whichever is first. We set the maximum number of iterations of the descent method to 10 and a tolerance of 10^1 , whichever comes first. Robustness tests showed no significant change in the flow vector or transition and starting probabilities, when the tolerance was decreased or the maximum number of iterations increased. For uniform pricing we tested $p \in [0, 1600]$ with steps of 100 which gives us 17 options. For per-stratum pricing, we consider low-income price p_l , mid-income price p_m , high-income price $p_h \in [0, 1600]$ with steps of 200 and a restriction of $p_l \leq p_m \leq p_h$ which gives us roughly 800 possible combinations. Note that we do not test other ordering of prices as they would result in worse welfare for lower-income strata; in practice, it would be impractical to charge a higher price to lower-income strata. Finally, for per-area pricing, we consider $p_N, p_W, p_E, p_S \in [0, 1600]$ with steps of 200, resulting in 6561 price combinations.¹⁴

Acceleration Tools. There are several parts in Algorithm 1 that are computationally expensive. First, the logit choice model is known to be numerically unstable, in particular, when one of the arguments $z_{a,d}^s$ is much higher or lower than the rest. For this, we use the `logsumexp` function in the `scipy` library. This function was implemented in such a way that, for a given $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$, we can efficiently compute $\varphi_{i,d}^s$ (in Step 5) and $P_{i,d}^s$ (in Step 6) for all $i \neq d$. Second, note that the

¹⁴ Given our area split, note that the number of combinations for area pricing increases as n^4 where n is the number of options.

for-loop in Step 4 only needs to go over those $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$ such that $g_{i,d}^s > 0$. Third, there are two main computationally expensive parts in the algorithm: (i) the fixed-point iteration in Step 5 and (ii) solving the linear system in Step 8. For (i), we significantly reduce the number of iterations in (16) by setting an appropriate initial point $\tau_{i,d}^{s,0}$: Using the arc-flows f_a 's obtained in the previous outer-loop iteration, we set $\tau_{i,d}^{s,0}$ as the lowest travel cost between i and d where each arc a has a cost $\ell_a(f_a) + (\beta^{s,p}/\beta^{s,t}) \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s)$. One can naïvely consider 0 as an initial point, however, this requires more iterations to converge. For (ii), we take advantage of the sparsity of the matrices, thus we use the corresponding scipy functions to solve sparse linear systems. Fourth, observe that the computations needed for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$ in the for-loop (Step 4) are independent, therefore we can parallelize this section of the algorithm using multiple cores in a single machine. Considering all the above, for a given set of prices, we run Algorithm 1 using 15 CPUs with each CPU having 8GB of RAM. Depending on the machine and on the pricing scheme, calculating the equilibrium flows for a given set of prices takes between 30 min and 3 hours. We ran all the combinations of prices in several machines on a cluster. For example, running all of the 6560 price combinations for area pricing took about 7 days.¹⁵

Simulation Setup to Calculate Metrics. After equilibria flows were obtained from Algorithm 1, we then ran simulations to mimic individual-level routing decisions. For each pricing scheme (and its corresponding flow equilibrium vector, transition probabilities, and starting probabilities) we run 10 simulations for each unit of demand in each OD pair to compute our *evaluation metrics* such as the proportion of trips started, revenue raised, travel time, and welfare.


6. Case study: Results for Congestion pricing in Bogota

We now apply our algorithmic framework to the design of congestion pricing in Bogotá, using the data and functional parameters as specified in the previous section.

Summary of the results. Our results can be summarized as follows: (a) uniform pricing is highly inequitable and inefficient (raising the least revenue); (b) per-stratum pricing can be highly equitable while raising the most revenue; (c) per-area pricing interpolates: it can raise a similar (though lesser) amount of revenue than per-stratum pricing *and* can be far more equitable than uniform pricing (though not as equitable as per-stratum pricing), with higher total welfare than per-stratum pricing.

¹⁵ To note the challenge of area pricing and of choosing a finer grid, for each price combination, several matrices (such as average travel time per OD pair) are stored. Then, the outputs of all of the price combinations used around 300-400GB of storage.

Figure 4 The effects of Uniform Pricing, with each metric calculated under the equilibrium for the associated pricing. Overall, uniform pricing has highly inequitable effects, disproportionately harming the low-income group that is most price-sensitive. This group starts fewer trips, uses the primary roads less, and has a lower average speed. Uniform pricing also severely impacts the low-income and mid-income groups in terms of welfare. We remark that we do not plot the welfare at price 0 in (e) because it is 0 by definition.



6.1. The Inequitable Effects of Uniform Pricing

We first study uniform pricing, with various metrics shown in Figure 4, split by group. As shown in Figure 4, for *every* choice of the uniform price that we evaluate (in the range $[0, 1600]$), the outcomes are highly inequitable: the low-income group starts a smaller fraction of trips (instead choosing their outside option), a higher fraction of their flows use secondary instead of primary roads, and their average welfare and speed are lower.

Several other facts are apparent from Figure 4. At the revenue optimal price (500), most trips still occur (the low-income group is the only group that uses the outside option at all, and still starts over 90% of trips) – thus, the revenue optimal price is ineffective at reducing congestion. This choice further leads to approximately the *lowest* average speed: prices are high enough that commuters (especially low-income) opt to use secondary roads instead of the tolled primary roads, but not so high that they opt to instead use their outside option. At lower prices, more commuters use primary roads; at higher prices, fewer use primary roads but the proportion of trips started also decreases, and so the average speed on both primary and secondary roads increases. Thus, welfare is also low at revenue-optimal uniform pricing, with few congestion benefits. The welfare of the high-income group decreases substantially at higher prices, not due to travel times but rather higher monetary costs. The welfare of the other strata recovers for higher prices, because they are using secondary roads.

More broadly, the uniform pricing results reflect that our algorithmic approach produces *plausible* outputs, and can capture non-trivial phenomena – such as the fact that traffic flows, average speeds, and revenue (an equilibria object that depends on prices and the decisions of other agents) are highly non-monotonic.

Table 4 Revenue Optimal Prices and their effects for each pricing scheme. For these results, we consider a step size of 200 in uniform pricing.

Pricing Scheme	Revenue Opt. Price	Revenue	Low-income Welfare
Uniform p	600	7,550,749	-837
Per Stratum (p_h, p_m, p_l)	(1000, 600, 400)	7,938,503	-863
Per Area (p_N, p_W, p_E, p_S)	(800, 600, 400, 1000)	7,731,546	-804

6.2. Comparing Uniform to Per-Stratum and Area Pricing

Next, we compare uniform pricing to per-stratum and per-area (spatial) pricing. As these prices are multi-dimensional (one price per stratum or area), we cannot plot curves as in Figure 4. Instead, we compare them by plotting Pareto curves – for each stratum, what is the Pareto curve in terms of a single stratum’s welfare and total welfare achievable by each pricing scheme (Figure 5); we

Figure 5 Pareto frontiers for Welfare for a given stratum vs Total Welfare, for different pricing schemes. Shapes denote the stratum for which welfare is being plotted on the Y axis (low, medium, or high), colors denote the pricing scheme, and numbers indicate the price vector. We plot the Pareto curves for each scheme and stratum. For example, there is only one Pareto optimal uniform price ($p = 200$) for each pair of Total Welfare and Welfare for mid-income and high-income strata; for low-income stratum the Pareto optimal points are $p = 1600$ and $p = 200$. At $p = 200$, welfare for the high-income group is higher than the welfare for the other groups. As another example, the optimal per-stratum pricing scheme (for each stratum), denoted in green, can yield more Total Welfare and per-stratum Welfare than the uniform pricing. The welfare achieved by area pricing is comparable to that of personalized pricing. Note that we omit uniformly 0 prices as those would generally dominate all other pricing (giving 0 welfare for each group), while providing no revenue.




Table 5 Metrics under the prices that are optimal for Low-Income Stratum's Welfare, for each pricing scheme.

Pricing Scheme	Low-income Opt. Price	Revenue	Low-income Welfare
Uniform p	1600	4,656,947	-587
Per Stratum (p_h, p_m, p_l)	(1600, 1600, 0)	4,132,440	2
Per Area (p_N, p_W, p_E, p_S)	(0, 200, 0, 0)	1,023,208	-81

also compare these schemes by plotting Pareto curves for stratum's welfare versus total revenue collected (Figure 6); we further compare the schemes by the highest revenue that they can achieve (Table 4) and the welfare they provide to the low-income group (Table 5). We now discuss these results in turn.

Figure 5 illustrates the Pareto curves achievable by each scheme, in terms of welfare for a given stratum versus total welfare. For example, the green circle curve is the Pareto curve of welfare

for the low-income group versus total welfare, with the highest welfare point for the low-income stratum being at the price point (1600, 1600, 0), i.e., the other strata are charged maximal prices. Several key insights emerge from these Pareto curves:

- As expected, per-stratum pricing can achieve the optimal per-strata welfare. In particular, with per-strata pricing, we can reverse the effects of uniform pricing: we can achieve higher welfare for the low- and mid-income groups, at considerable welfare loss for the high-income group. (Compare the green Pareto curves to the black shapes; notably, only one Uniform price ($p = 200$) is Pareto optimal among Uniform prices).

- Perhaps surprisingly, the per-area pricing schemes yield the highest total welfare – though they cannot achieve as high of per-strata welfare as an appropriate per-stratum pricing can. (Compare the red curves to the green curves, and note that the latter are above and to the left of the red curves).

- The per-area pricing scheme Pareto dominates uniform pricing: Note that the scheme (0, 200, 0, 0), indicating just pricing for roads in the W area, has higher total welfare and per-strata welfare for each strata than does the Pareto optimal uniform price $p = 200$. (Note that the red curves are above and to the left of the corresponding black curve of the same shape).

- Neither per-area pricing nor per-strata pricing dominate each other. Per-strata pricing can achieve higher welfare for low- and mid-income strata, at the cost of (much) lower total and high-income Welfare. (Neither green or red set of curves is above and to the right of the other set).


- The Pareto optimal schemes for area pricing are given by the set of prices (200, 0, 0, 0) and (0, 200, 0, 0) which means that either N or W area get priced. These corresponds to the second most used by high-income and low-income strata, respectively.

We remark that, by definition, the per-stratum welfare is 0 for the zero pricing scheme, which we do not plot in Figure 5 and Pareto dominates the uniform and area pricing points. However, such pricing would raise no revenue.

To further compare our pricing schemes, Figure 6 contains Pareto curves for stratum welfare versus total revenue, with analogous insights as before. For the low-income stratum, personalized pricing (in green) Pareto dominates uniform pricing (in blue) and almost dominates area pricing (in red). Area pricing leads to higher welfare and revenue than uniform pricing. Surprisingly, for the mid-income group, there is no dominance between area pricing and personalized pricing, and in fact personalized pricing is closer to uniform pricing. Finally, for the high-income stratum, there is no difference between personalized pricing and uniform pricing, while per-area pricing almost dominates them.

Next, we consider the prices that optimize revenue (Table 4) and the prices that optimize low-income welfare under each pricing scheme (Table 5). These results tell a similar story as the welfare

Figure 6 Pareto frontiers for Welfare for a given stratum vs Total Revenue, for different pricing schemes. Colors denote the pricing scheme. We plot the Pareto curves for each scheme and stratum. For example, for the low-income stratum, per-stratum pricing (in green) almost Pareto dominates area pricing (in red). We remark that in (c), the blue curve is over the green one, which is technically not possible, however, this is due to the price grid for per-stratum pricing that we considered, and linear interpolation between the analyzed points (there exists a green point there that should be at least as good as the blue curve).



and revenue Pareto curves: Uniform pricing is dominated by what the other schemes *can* achieve. However, each given choice of per-stratum or per-area prices chooses a different point of the tradeoff curve. In the Appendix, Figures 9 and 10, we show more evidence of this tradeoff. In particular, we plot the percentage of trips started versus revenue and primary flow usage for per-stratum and per-area pricing. Overall, we observe an analogous pattern than uniform pricing, however, these pricing schemes provide more flexibility to balance revenue, primary flow usage and percentage of trips started.

Putting things together, our results suggest that either per-stratum or per-area pricing – depending on relative implementation feasibility – are promising strategies for Bogotá. Area pricing in particular can achieve higher per-stratum (for each stratum) welfare, total welfare, and revenue

than uniform pricing. This is true despite the coarse grid we chose for per-area pricing. Per-stratum pricing can achieve higher welfare for low- and mid-income groups, at a substantial cost to the high-income group. In Appendix C, we study through synthetic experiments how the topology of the network and the segregation in the demand affects the benefits of personalized and area pricing.

7. Conclusions

In this work, we study equitable congestion pricing schemes under the Markovian traffic equilibrium model. An essential aspect of this model is its ability to capture the variability in route costs perceptions. We extended this model in several directions: (i) We allow for multiple users' socioeconomic types, (ii) we introduce a generalized cost function that accounts for travel time and pricing costs, and (iii) we include an outside option choice at the start of each trip. In this setting, we show that there exists a unique equilibrium. We test our methodology with a dataset from Bogotá provided by our industry partner. Our empirical results have practical insights. First, uniform pricing negatively impacts every single metric, except revenue, especially inequitably. Second, per-stratum pricing can achieve higher low-income and mid-income welfare, at the expense of high-income welfare. Finally, per-area pricing appropriately interpolates both of the previous pricing schemes.

Several research directions remain to be explored. First, it would be interesting to analyze other pricing cost functions, for example, not dependent on distance. Second, other pricing schemes that could potentially interpolate between per-stratum pricing and uniform pricing are paying per destination or only once you enter a specific area, as New York City considered (New York Times 2023). Third, as we observed in our empirical results, congestion pricing impacts everyone's welfare, potentially inequitably, further suggesting the need for implementing revenue refunding schemes or using the funding to improve, for example, public transportation. Finally, from a theoretical standpoint, the question of how to globally solve the price optimization Problems (17) and (18) is an interesting direction for future research.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Emma Frejinger for preliminary discussions on the model, Roberto Cominetti for the helpful discussions on Theorem 1 and the code of their original method, Frederic Charlier and Laura Iguavita from ClearRoad for providing data from their pilot in Bogota.

References

- Adler JL, Cetin M (2001) A direct redistribution model of congestion pricing. *Transportation research part B: methodological* 35(5):447–460.
- Arnott R, Small K (1994) The economics of traffic congestion. *American scientist* 82(5):446–455.

- Baillon JB, Cominetti R (2008) Markovian traffic equilibrium. *Mathematical Programming* 111(1-2):33–56.
- Barre T, Housni OE, Brahim MI, Lodi A, Segev D (2024) Assortment optimization with visibility constraints.
- Beckmann M, McGuire CB, Winsten CB (1956) Studies in the economics of transportation. Technical report.
- Bernstein D (1993) Congestion pricing with tolls and subsidies. *Pacific Rim TransTech Conference—Volume II: International Ties, Management Systems, Propulsion Technology, Strategic Highway Research Program*, 145–151 (ASCE).
- Bertsimas D, Farias VF, Trichakis N (2011) The price of fairness. *Operations research* 59(1):17–31.
- Bertsimas D, Farias VF, Trichakis N (2012) On the efficiency-fairness trade-off. *Management Science* 58(12):2234–2250.
- Bimpikis K, Candogan O, Saban D (2019) Spatial pricing in ride-sharing networks. *Operations Research* 67(3):744–769.
- Bonifaci V, Salek M, Schäfer G (2011) Efficiency of restricted tolls in non-atomic network routing games. *Algorithmic Game Theory: 4th International Symposium, SAGT 2011, Amalfi, Italy, October 17-19, 2011. Proceedings 4*, 302–313 (Springer).
- Braess D, Nagurney A, Wakolbinger T (2005) On a paradox of traffic planning. *Transportation science* 39(4):446–450.
- Brotcorne L, Labbé M, Marcotte P, Savard G (2001) A bilevel model for toll optimization on a multicommodity transportation network. *Transportation science* 35(4):345–358.
- Brown PN, Marden JR (2016) A study on price-discrimination for robust social coordination. *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 1699–1704 (IEEE).
- Bureau of Public Roads (1964) Traffic assignment manual for application with a large, high speed computer. *US Department of Commerce, Office of Planning, Urban Planning Division* .
- Castillo JC (2023) Who benefits from surge pricing? *Available at SSRN 3245533* .
- Castro F, Gao J, Martin S (2023) Autonomous vehicles in ride-hailing and the threat of spatial inequalities. *Available at SSRN 4332493* .
- ClearRoad (2024) Clearroad. URL clearroad.io.
- Cohen MC, Elmachtoub AN, Lei X (2022) Price discrimination with fairness constraints. *Management Science* 68(12):8536–8552.
- Cohen MC, Miao S, Wang Y (2021) Dynamic pricing with fairness constraints. *Available at SSRN 3930622* .
- Cole R, Dodis Y, Roughgarden T (2003) Pricing network edges for heterogeneous selfish users. *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 521–530.
- Cominetti R, Dose V, Scarsini M (2021) The price of anarchy in routing games as a function of the demand. *Mathematical Programming* 1–28.

- Cominetti R, Facchinei F, Lasserre JB (2012) *Modern optimization modelling techniques* (Springer Science & Business Media).
- Correa JR, Schulz AS, Stier-Moses NE (2004) Selfish routing in capacitated networks. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 29(4):961–976.
- Cramton P, Geddes RR, Ockenfels A (2018) Set road charges in real time to ease traffic.
- Daganzo CF (1982) Unconstrained extremal formulation of some transportation equilibrium problems. *Transportation Science* 16(3):332–360.
- Daganzo CF, Sheffi Y (1977) On stochastic models of traffic assignment. *Transportation science* 11(3):253–274.
- Datos Abiertos Bogotá (2024) Manzana Estratificación, Bogotá D.C. Secretaría Distrital de Planeación. URL <https://www.ideca.gov.co/recursos/mapas/manzana-estratificacion-bogota-dc>.
- Dial RB (1971) A probabilistic multipath traffic assignment model which obviates path enumeration. *Transportation research* 5(2):83–111.
- Eliasson J (2001) Road pricing with limited information and heterogeneous users: A successful case. *The annals of regional science* 35:595–604.
- Eliasson J (2016) Is congestion pricing fair? consumer and citizen perspectives on equity effects. *Transport Policy* 52:1–15.
- Eliasson J, Mattsson LG (2006) Equity effects of congestion pricing: quantitative methodology and a case study for stockholm. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 40(7):602–620.
- Feng R, Zhang H, Shi B, Zhong Q, Yao B (2023) Collaborative road pricing strategy for heterogeneous vehicles considering emission constraints. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 429:139561.
- Ferrari P (2002) Road network toll pricing and social welfare. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 36(5):471–483.
- Florian M, Hearn D (1995) Network equilibrium models and algorithms. *Handbooks in operations research and management science* 8:485–550.
- Florian M, Hearn D (1999) Network equilibrium and pricing. *Handbook of transportation science* 361–393.
- Freund D, van Ryzin G (2021) Pricing fast and slow: Limitations of dynamic pricing mechanisms in ride-hailing. Available at SSRN 3931844 .
- Fukushima M (1984) On the dual approach to the traffic assignment problem. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 18(3):235–245.
- Garg N, Nazerzadeh H (2022) Driver surge pricing. *Management Science* 68(5):3219–3235.
- Gemicci K, Koutsoupias E, Monnot B, Papadimitriou C, Piliouras G (2018) Wealth inequality and the price of anarchy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09269* .

- Goodwin P (1990) How to make road pricing popular. *Economic Affairs* 10(5):6–7.
- Guo X, Yang H (2010) Pareto-improving congestion pricing and revenue refunding with multiple user classes. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 44(8-9):972–982.
- Harks T, Kleinert I, Klimm M, Möhring RH (2015) Computing network tolls with support constraints. *Networks* 65(3):262–285.
- Hoefer M, Olbrich L, Skopalik A (2008) Taxing subnetworks. *International workshop on internet and network economics*, 286–294 (Springer).
- Hu B, Hu M, Zhu H (2022) Surge pricing and two-sided temporal responses in ride hailing. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* 24(1):91–109.
- INRIX (2022) Inrix 2022 traffic scorecard report. URL <https://inrix.com/scorecard/>.
- Jalota D, Solovey K, Gopalakrishnan K, Zoepf S, Balakrishnan H, Pavone M (2021) When efficiency meets equity in congestion pricing and revenue refunding schemes. *Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*, 1–11.
- Jessel E (2017) “If I’m stratum 3, that’s who I am”: Inside Bogotá’s social stratification system. *The Guardian*. URL <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/nov/09/bogota-colombia-social-stratification-system>.
- Jo N, Tang B, Dullerud K, Aghaei S, Rice E, Vayanos P (2023) Fairness in contextual resource allocation systems: Metrics and incompatibility results. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, 11837–11846.
- Johari R, Tsitsiklis JN (2004) Efficiency loss in a network resource allocation game. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 29(3):407–435.
- Kallus N, Zhou A (2021) Fairness, welfare, and equity in personalized pricing. *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, 296–314.
- Knight FH (1924) Some fallacies in the interpretation of social cost. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 38(4):582–606.
- Labbé M, Marcotte P, Savard G (1998) A bilevel model of taxation and its application to optimal highway pricing. *Management science* 44(12-part-1):1608–1622.
- Larsson T, Patriksson M (1998) Side constrained traffic equilibrium models—traffic management through link tolls. *Equilibrium and advanced transportation modelling*, 125–151 (Springer).
- Lawphongpanich S, Yin Y (2007) Pareto-improving congestion pricing for general road networks. *Technique Report. Gainesville, FL: Department of industrial and System Engineering, University of Florida* .
- Lawphongpanich S, Yin Y (2010) Solving the pareto-improving toll problem via manifold suboptimization. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 18(2):234–246.

- Lazar DA, Pedarsani R (2020) Optimal tolling for multitype mixed autonomous traffic networks. *IEEE Control Systems Letters* 5(5):1849–1854.
- Levinson D (2010) Equity effects of road pricing: A review. *Transport Reviews* 30(1):33–57.
- Lim AC (2002) *Transportation network design problems: An MPEC approach* (The Johns Hopkins University).
- Liu Z, Bhandaram U, Garg N (2023) Quantifying spatial under-reporting disparities in resident crowdsourcing. *Nature Computational Science* 1–9.
- Liu Z, Garg N (2024) Redesigning service level agreements: Equity and efficiency in city government operations.
- Lobel I (2021) Revenue management and the rise of the algorithmic economy. *Management Science* 67(9):5389–5398.
- Ma H, Fang F, Parkes DC (2022) Spatio-temporal pricing for ridesharing platforms. *Operations Research* 70(2):1025–1041.
- Maheshwari C, Kulkarni K, Pai D, Yang J, Wu M, Sastry S (2024) Congestion pricing for efficiency and equity: Theory and applications to the san francisco bay area. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16844* .
- Manshadi V, Niazadeh R, Rodilitz S (2021) Fair dynamic rationing. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, 694–695.
- Mehr N, Horowitz R (2019) Pricing traffic networks with mixed vehicle autonomy. *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2676–2682 (IEEE).
- Monderer D, Shapley LS (1996) Potential games. *Games and economic behavior* 14(1):124–143.
- New York Times (2023) What to know about congestion pricing.
- Nisan N, Roughgarden T, Tardos E, Vazirani V (2007) *Algorithmic Game Theory* (Cambridge University Press).
- Patriksson M, Rockafellar RT (2002) A mathematical model and descent algorithm for bilevel traffic management. *Transportation Science* 36(3):271–291.
- Pigou AC (1912) *Wealth and welfare* (Macmillan and Company, limited).
- Rahmattalabi A, Vayanos P, Dullerud K, Rice E (2022) Learning resource allocation policies from observational data with an application to homeless services delivery. *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1240–1256.
- Rosenthal RW (1973) A class of games possessing pure-strategy nash equilibria. *International Journal of Game Theory* 2:65–67.
- Roughgarden T (2005) *Selfish routing and the price of anarchy* (MIT press).
- Roughgarden T, Tardos É (2002) How bad is selfish routing? *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 49(2):236–259.

- Roughgarden T, Tardos É (2004) Bounding the inefficiency of equilibria in nonatomic congestion games. *Games and economic behavior* 47(2):389–403.
- Secretaría Distrital de Planeación Bogotá (2024) Estratificación socioeconómica (in Spanish). URL <https://www.sdp.gov.co/gestion-estudios-estrategicos/estratificacion/generalidades>.
- Singh S, Shah B, Kanich C, Kash IA (2022) Fair decision-making for food inspections. *Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*, 1–11.
- Small KA (1992) Using the revenues from congestion pricing. *Transportation* 19:359–381.
- Smith M (1979) The marginal cost taxation of a transportation network. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 13(3):237–242.
- Song Z, Yin Y, Lawphongpanich S (2009) Nonnegative pareto-improving tolls with multiclass network equilibria. *Transportation Research Record* 2091(1):70–78.
- TomTom (2023) Tomtom traffic index. URL <https://www.tomtom.com/traffic-index/ranking/>.
- Wachs M (2005) Then and now: The evolution of congestion pricing in transportation and where we stand today. *Transportation Research Board Conference Proceedings*, number 34.
- Wardrop JG (1952) Road paper. some theoretical aspects of road traffic research. *Proceedings of the institution of civil engineers* 1(3):325–362.
- Wu D, Yin Y, Lawphongpanich S, Yang H (2012) Design of more equitable congestion pricing and tradable credit schemes for multimodal transportation networks. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 46(9):1273–1287.
- Yan C, Zhu H, Korolko N, Woodard D (2020) Dynamic pricing and matching in ride-hailing platforms. *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)* 67(8):705–724.

Appendix A: Appendix to Section 2.2.1

Notation. In the following, for each stratum s and destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$, we consider the following notation:

- Transition matrix $\mathbf{P}^{s,d}(\mathbf{z}_d^s) = (P_{i,j}^{s,d})_{i,j \neq d}$.
- Auxiliary matrix $\mathbf{Q}^{s,d}(\mathbf{z}_d^s) = (Q_{i,a}^{s,d})_{i \in \mathcal{N}, a \in \mathcal{A}}$, where $Q_{i,a}^{s,d} = P_{i,j_a}^{s,d}$ if $i = i_a$ and zero otherwise.

To ease the exposition, in the remainder we avoid the explicit dependency on \mathbf{z}_d^s of the matrices above.

We now provide the technical lemmas to prove Theorem 1. First, note that \mathcal{C} as defined in (9) is open, convex (because functions $\varphi_{i,d}^s$ are concave) and upward closed, i.e., for each $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{C}$ then for any $\mathbf{t}' \geq \mathbf{t}$ component-wise we have $\mathbf{t}' \in \mathcal{C}$ (because functions $\varphi_{i,d}^s$ are component-wise nondecreasing). The first technical lemma we need is

LEMMA 1. *Fix $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$. Assume that $\tau_{i,d}^s$ solves (6) for a given $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{C}$ and let $z_{a,d}^s = t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) + \tau_{j_a,d}^s$. Then,*

1. *For each $i \neq d$ there exists $j \in \mathcal{N}$ with $P_{i,j}^{s,d} > 0$ and $\delta_{j,d}^s < \delta_{i,d}^s$, where $\delta_{i,d}^s = \tau_{i,d}^s - \hat{\tau}_{i,d}^s$ with $\hat{\tau}_{i,d}^s$ such that for all $i \neq d$*

$$\hat{\tau}_{i,d}^s < \varphi_{i,d}^s \left(\left(t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) + \tau_{j_a,d}^s \right)_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \right).$$

2. *The matrix $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^{s,d}$ is invertible, with \mathbf{I} being the identity matrix.*
3. *Equations (7) have a unique solution $\mathbf{v}_d^s = (\mathbf{Q}^{s,d})^\top \mathbf{x}_d^s$ with $\mathbf{x}_d^s = [\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{P}^{s,d})^\top]^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{g}_d^s$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.2 (pages 225-226) in (Cominetti et al. 2012), so we just make a few remarks on where there are differences.

1. The proof follows similarly by defining $\hat{z}_{a,d}^s = t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) + \hat{\tau}_{j_a,d}^s$ and $z_{a,d}^s = t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) + \tau_{j_a,d}^s$. Then, we use the concavity and smoothness of function $\varphi_{i,d}^s$ and note that $\hat{z}_{a,d}^s - z_{a,d}^s = \hat{\tau}_{j_a,d}^s - \tau_{j_a,d}^s$.

The extra term $\frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s)$ in $z_{a,d}^s$ does not affect the proofs of 2. and 3. \square

PROPOSITION 1. *If $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{C}$ then for each stratum $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$ the Equations (6) have unique solutions $\tau_{i,d}^s = \tau_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$. Moreover, the maps $\mathbf{t} \mapsto \tau_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$ are smooth, concave and component-wise nondecreasing.*

Since the monetary costs do not depend on the flow of the arc, then the extra term $\frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s)$ in $z_{a,d}^s$ does not affect the proof in Proposition 2.3 (page 226) in (Cominetti et al. 2012), so we conclude Proposition 1 by using the results in Lemma 1. We finally remark that $\tau_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t}) \leq \bar{\tau}_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$ where $\bar{\tau}_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$ are the shortest travel times that satisfy

$$\bar{\tau}_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t}) = \min \{ t_a + \bar{\tau}_{j_a,d}^s(\mathbf{t}) : a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+ \}, \quad (21)$$

which can be easily computed with a shortest path algorithm where each arc's weight is t_a .

The main consequence of Proposition 1 is that Equations (6) and (7) define unique implicit functions $x_{i,d}^s = x_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$, $v_{a,d}^s = v_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$ and $\tau_{i,d}^s = \tau_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$ which is crucial to Theorem 1. We finish this section by presenting missing proofs.

LEMMA 2. *Function Φ defined in (10) is strictly convex and coercive in region $\{\mathbf{t} \geq \mathbf{t}^0\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the first part of the proof in Theorem 2.5 (page 228) in (Cominetti et al. 2012). \square

LEMMA 3. *For all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we have that*

$$\sum_{i \neq d} g_{i,d}^s \cdot \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial t_a}(\mathbf{t}) = v_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t}).$$

Proof. Now recall that $\tau_{i,d}^s$ satisfies Equation (6), which can be represented as a function of \mathbf{t} as follows:

$$\tau_{i,d}^s(\mathbf{t}) = \varphi_{i,d}^s \left((z_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t}))_{a \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \right),$$

where $z_{a,d}^s(\mathbf{t}) = t_a + \frac{\beta^{s,p}}{\beta^{s,t}} \cdot \kappa_a(p_a^s) + \tau_{j_a,d}^s(\mathbf{t})$. In the following, we omit the notation for the explicit dependency on \mathbf{t} . Then, by taking the implicit derivative with respect to t_a , we obtain with the chain rule

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial t_a} &= \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial z_{e,d}^s} \cdot \frac{\partial z_{e,d}^s}{\partial t_a} = \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial z_{a,d}^s} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\partial \tau_{j_a,d}^s}{\partial t_a} \right) + \sum_{\substack{e \in \mathcal{A}_i^+, \\ e \neq a}} \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial z_{e,d}^s} \cdot \frac{\partial \tau_{j_e,d}^s}{\partial t_a} \\ &= \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial z_{a,d}^s} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial z_{e,d}^s} \cdot \frac{\partial \tau_{j_e,d}^s}{\partial t_a} \\ &= P_{i,j_a}^s + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{A}_i^+} P_{i,j_e}^s \cdot \frac{\partial \tau_{j_e,d}^s}{\partial t_a}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where in the second equality we used that $\frac{\partial z_{e,d}^s}{\partial t_a} = 1 + \frac{\partial \tau_{j_a,d}^s}{\partial t_a}$ for $e = a$ and $\frac{\partial z_{e,d}^s}{\partial t_a} = \frac{\partial \tau_{j_a,d}^s}{\partial t_a}$ for all $e \in \mathcal{A}_i^+$ with $e \neq a$. In the last equality, we used that the transition probability satisfies $P_{i,j_e}^s = \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial z_{e,d}^s}$ with $e = (i, j_e)$ for all $e \in \mathcal{A}_i^+$. Therefore, we can write (22) in vector form for $i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $i \neq d$ as follows

$$\frac{\partial \tau_{\cdot,d}^s}{\partial t_a} = \mathbf{Q}_{\cdot,a}^{s,d} + \mathbf{P}^{s,d} \cdot \frac{\partial \tau_{\cdot,d}^s}{\partial t_a},$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_{\cdot,a}^{s,d} = (P_{i,j_a}^s)_{i \neq d}$ and $\mathbf{P}^{s,d} = (P_{i,j}^s)_{i,j \neq d}$. So, since $\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^{s,d}$ is invertible (due to Lemma 1) with \mathbf{I} being the identity matrix, then

$$\frac{\partial \tau_{\cdot,d}^s}{\partial t_a} = [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}^{s,d}]^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{Q}_{\cdot,a}^{s,d} \quad (23)$$

Using (23), we can compute the following for a given destination $d \in \mathcal{D}^s$

$$\sum_{i \neq d} \frac{\partial \tau_{i,d}^s}{\partial t_a} g_{i,d}^s = \left(\frac{\partial \tau_{\cdot,d}^s}{\partial t_a} \right)^\top \mathbf{g}_{\cdot,d}^s = (\mathbf{Q}_{\cdot,a}^{s,d})^\top \cdot [\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{P}^{s,d})^\top]^{-1} \mathbf{g}_{\cdot,d}^s = (\mathbf{Q}_{\cdot,a}^{s,d})^\top \mathbf{x}_{\cdot,d}^s = v_{a,d}^s,$$

where the last two inequalities follow from the flow conservation constraints (7). \square

Appendix B: Appendix to Section 5.2

Figure 7 Primary roads are in red and secondary roads in blue.




Figure 8 Bogotá stratification, 2019. Map and legend taken from (Datos Abiertos Bogotá 2024).



B.1. Additional Figures

Figure 9 In (a), we show revenue versus percentage of trips started (each point corresponds to a set of prices). In (b), we present the percentage of primary flow versus percentage of trips started. Overall we observe a similar pattern than for uniform pricing: For the low-income stratum, as the proportion of started trips decreases then the revenue contribution decreases since they use mostly secondary roads. The opposite pattern applies to the high-income stratum whose contribution to revenue increases. For primary flow, we observe that the percentage used by high-income stratum increases, while the rest decreases (as the percentage of trips started decreases).





Figure 10 In (a), we show revenue versus percentage of trips started (each point corresponds to a set of prices). In (b), we present the percentage of primary flow versus percentage of trips started. The pattern in this plot is less apparent, but we can observe that most of the revenue collected comes from the mid-income stratum (regardless of the percentage of trips started). In terms of primary flow, we observe again that the high-income stratum tends to benefit.



Appendix C: Results on Synthetic Data

In this section, we briefly discuss our experimental study on synthetic instances. We show how the topology of the network and the segregation in the demand affects the benefits of personalized and area pricing. We find, in particular, that the benefit of per-area pricing in the above analysis depends crucially on the network and demand structure.

Figure 11 Single OD Network.





Figure 12 10 by 10 grid network.



C.1. Single OD Pair: Area Pricing is not Strictly Better than Uniform Pricing


We consider a simple network composed of 4 nodes and 6 arcs (2 primary),¹⁶ depicted in Figure 11: Blue arcs denote secondary roads and red arcs indicate primary roads. Secondary arcs length is 3km and speed is 40km/h, while primary arcs (which have 3 lanes) length is 5km and speed is 80km/h. We computed the capacity of each arc as in the Bogotá case study. We considered 3 strata: high, mid, and low. Each stratum has the same OD pair 0 to 3, and the same demand equal to 500 trips. Most of the parameters that we chose for this instance are the same as in our experiments for Bogotá (we do not change the sensitivity parameters), except for the outside option costs which we set as follows: $\hat{t}_{0,3}$ is 1.2 times the time between 0 and 3 when roads are empty and $\hat{p}_{0,3} = 300$.¹⁷ In this setting, we tested a price grid in $[0, 200]$ with a step of 25.

In Figures 13a, 13b and 13c, we present the results for this set of experiments.¹⁸ Specifically, in (a) we show the primary road usage for different uniform prices, in (b) we present the stratum-welfare vs total welfare Pareto curves, in (c) we show the stratum-welfare versus total revenue

¹⁶ Some of the arcs are dummy arcs to make the network strongly connected, which do not have any flow.

¹⁷ We changed these values so the outside option is attractive for users.


¹⁸ We obtain similar results than for Bogotá in terms of trips started, average speed, revenue generated and welfare, so to avoid redundancy we do not present those.

Figure 13 Results for a Single OD Pair.

Pareto curves. Analogous to the Bogotá case study, uniform pricing is highly inequitable for the low-income population in every metric. In particular, the usage of primary roads by the low-income stratum goes to zero after the optimal revenue price which is 50. Similarly, the mid-income stratum is negatively affected by the uniform price after $p = 75$. In (b), we further observe the benefit of personalized pricing for any strata. However, we note that the Pareto curves for uniform and area pricing are the same (single points in red and in blue which cover each other). This empirically shows that area pricing is not strictly better than uniform pricing. Analogous conclusions can be observed in the stratum-welfare versus total revenue Pareto curves in Figure 13c (note that the area pricing curve in red covers the uniform pricing curve in blue). Technically, this occurs because there is a single OD pair and, for area pricing, we price the arc according to the geographical position of the entry node, i.e., in this setting the location of 0. We note that no matter how we split the network, the only affected arc is $(0, 3)$, so whatever we price the area in which 0 is, then that it coincides with uniform pricing.

REMARK 2. One could also similarly show that personalized pricing is not strictly better than uniform pricing. For this, consider three copies of the singled OD network in Figure 11 which are connected arbitrarily to keep the network strongly connected. Then, each stratum has a single OD pair demand in only one of the copies. We can observe that in this setting, setting a price p for a specific stratum would lead to the same equilibrium in the corresponding copy than pricing everyone at p .

Figure 14 Results on a Grid Network.



C.2. Grid Network with Uniform Demand

We now test a more complex network than the single OD pair studied above. We consider a 10 by 10 grid network composed of 100 nodes and 252 arcs (108 are primary), which is depicted in Figure 12: Blue arcs denote secondary roads (in both directions per pair of nodes), red arcs indicate primary roads (one-way direction per pair of nodes). Primary roads (which have 3 lanes)

length is 1.2km and speed is 80km/h, while secondary roads length is 0.6km and speed is 30km/h. Capacities were computed as before. Dashed lines in gray indicate the area split. We note that the area split is a 2 by 2 grid resulting in areas: NW, NE, SW, SE.

We consider the same set of strata and the demand is constructed as follows: Among all possible pairs of nodes, we consider only those that have a minimum traveling distance (shortest path) of at least 5km. Then, we group them according to area-to-area pairs, e.g., NW to NE. For each group, we sampled 10 OD pairs for which we set a demand (equally for all strata) of 10 trips – thus, demand may vary spatially (through randomness of the 10 pairs) but is identical across strata. The rest of the parameters are set as in the Bogotá study, except for $\hat{p}_{i,d}$ which we set to 400 to make the outside option more attractive. The price grid is taken from the interval $[0, 1600]$ with step of 200 and for pricing per area we only consider combinations with prices 0 and 1600.¹⁹

We present our results in Figure 14a, Figure 14b, and Figure 14c. We obtain the same results as in the previous experiments: uniform pricing highly affects the low-income population, which can be observed in the percentage of primary roads used (Figure 14a). The Pareto curves in Figure 14c show that pricing per stratum can significantly benefit the low- and mid-income groups at the cost of the high-income stratum. We also note that pricing per area is strictly dominated by personalized pricing, due to the uniform distribution of the demand. In terms of total welfare area pricing dominates uniform pricing, however, if one aims to maximize revenue (Figure 14c), then area pricing achieves the same levels of low-income welfare as uniform pricing (bottom right), due to the uniform demand (the red curve covers the blue curve).

The results above suggest that the benefits of area pricing may be inherently correlated with the segregation of the demand across the city. We expect the effectiveness of per-area pricing to generalize in cities with geographic population heterogeneity. We further expect similar results in terms of other demographic and socioeconomic heterogeneity, since cities have geographic segregation across such dimensions.

Appendix D: Robustness Analysis for Uniform Pricing

Our goal in this section is to test different parameters in the model to find which are the most relevant for the insights in our work. For this, we test Bogotá at different scales and demand, sensitivity to willingness to pay, sensitivity parameters of the outside option, and demand perturbations. Our main takeaway from these results is that the only parameters that matter for uniform pricing inequity are the willingness to pay differences. Uniform pricing inequity is monotonic in differences and does not change when the higher strata relatively prefer the outside option, the lower stratum has higher overall demand, the lower stratum is more likely to use primary roads without pricing


¹⁹ We do not test other combinations due to the results in the Bogotá study.

(as in the 10km scale), etc. Similarly, per-strata beats per-area for low-income welfare, but per-area beats per-strata for overall welfare consistently as the sensitivity to willingness to pay varies. In the following, to avoid redundancy, we just present the results for the usage of primary roads (we obtained similar results for other metrics and pricing schemes).

D.1. Bogotá at Different Scales

In this set of experiments, we consider the same setting as in Section 5 with the same parameters, however, we change the radius of the city. We consider a radius of 2km and 5km. This affects the demand matrix and the proportion of trips across strata. For the 2km network (271 edges and 134 nodes), the demand is as follows: 154 trips for high-income, 1084 trips for mid-income, and 465 trips for low-income. On the other hand, for the 5km network (488 edges and 245 nodes), the demand is 563 trips for high-income, 2929 trips for mid-income, and 1608 trips for low-income. As we observed in Figure 15, uniform pricing negatively impacts the low-income stratum.


Figure 15 Bogotá at different scales.



D.2. Different Sensitivity to Willingness to Pay

For these experiments, we consider Bogotá with radius of 2km. To ease the exposition, we only consider a range of prices of [200, 700] with a step of 100. We define the willingness-to-pay (WTP) as the ratio $\theta^s = \beta^{s,t} / \beta^{s,p}$, where the higher this ratio is the more willing to pay the stratum is. We consider $\theta^s \in \{0.5, 0.8, 1.5, 2.0\}$ for all $s \in \{l, m, h\}$. We present the results in Figure 16, where the color legends are the same as the previous figures, i.e., green for low-income, orange for mid-income, and yellow for high-income. Each curve corresponds to a different WTP ratio for a given stratum. In each subplot, we present different orderings of θ^s .

The most intuitive ordering is shown in Figure 16a, where the ratios are increasing with income. We note that in any combination of ratios, the low-income stratum uses less percentage of primary

Figure 16 Different willingness-to-pay ratios.


roads. On the least natural ordering (decreasing with income), Figure 16b, we confirm that the stratum with the highest WTP ratio is the one that benefits the most. Figures 16c and 16d confirm this trend: in both plots, we observe that uniform pricing is inequitable for the strata with the lowest WTP ratio.

D.3. Different Sensitivity Parameters for The Outside Option

In this section, we also consider Bogotá with a radius of 2km and a range of prices of [200, 700] with a step of 100. The rest of the parameters are as in the 10km instance, except for the sensitivity parameters of the outside option. We define the willingness to take the outside option (WTO) ratio as $\hat{\theta}^s = \hat{\beta}^{s,t} / \hat{\beta}^{s,p}$, where the highest this ratio is the least willing to take the outside option the stratum is. We consider $\hat{\theta}^s \in \{0.8, 0.9, 1.0, 1.1, 1.2\}$ for all $s \in \{l, m, h\}$. We present the results in Figure 17, where the color legends are: green for low-income, orange for mid-income, and yellow for high-income. Each curve corresponds to a different WTO ratio for a given stratum. We present all possible orderings of $\hat{\theta}^s$. We observe that there is no significant change in trend, uniform pricing

negatively impacts the low-income stratum. The only difference is when the green curves start to decrease which may depend on the relation between the revenue optimal uniform price and the outside option cost.

Figure 17 Different WTO ratios.



D.4. Demand Matrix Perturbations

Finally, we test different perturbations of the demand, with uniform pricing. The setting is as follows: Bogotá with a 2km radius, the same parameters (including WTP and WTO) as in the 10km instance, and a price range of $[200, 700]$ with a step of 100. We consider the same OD pairs as in the original instance and we amplify the demand of each stratum in each OD pair uniformly at random by the same factor. For the high-income group with a random factor between 5 and 7, for the mid-income stratum with a random factor between 0 and 1, and for the low-income stratum with a random factor between 2 and 3.²⁰ We obtain two demand matrices: (1) 1442 trips for high-income, 1084 trips for mid-income, 1563 trips for low-income; (2) 771 trips for high-income, 389 trips for mid-income, 1173 trips for low-income. We present the results in Figure 18 from which we observe no significant change in our previous takeaways: Even if the demand of the low-income population is higher than the rest, they are negatively affected by uniform pricing.

²⁰ These numbers were chosen arbitrarily to make the perturbed matrices significantly different, in terms of numbers of trips, to the original one.

Figure 18 Perturbations of the Demand Matrix.